

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS
IN THE THEOLOGY OF
PETER MARTYR VERMIGLI (A.D. 1500 - 1562)

by

REV, JOSEPH C. McLELLAND, M.A., B.D.

A Thesis presented towards the degree Doctor of
Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh,
Department of Theology - April, 1953.



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION	page ii
PORTRAIT OF AN ECUMENICAL REFORMER	1

PART I : REVELATION AND SACRAMENT.

CHAPTER I : BY WORD AND SPIRIT	74
CHAPTER II : CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT <u>SIGNA</u>	90
CHAPTER III : CHRIST AND THE NEW TESTAMENT <u>SIGNA</u>	107

PART II : UNION WITH CHRIST

CHAPTER IV : THE MYSTICAL BODY	131
CHAPTER V : THE SACRAMENT OF REGENERATION	149
CHAPTER VI : THE SACRAMENT OF COMMUNICATION	174

PART III : REAL PRESENCE AND TRUE SACRIFICE

CHAPTER VII : THE EUCHARIST AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION	196
CHAPTER VIII : THE EUCHARIST AND UBIQUITY	221
CHAPTER IX : THE EUCHARIST AND TROPISM	242
CHAPTER X : THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE	250

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A : THE WORKS OF PETER MARTYR	284
APPENDIX B : SECONDARY SOURCES	288
APPENDIX C : PETER MARTYR'S PATRISTIC SOURCES	290
APPENDIX D : BUCER, CALVIN AND MARTYR	294
APPENDIX E : DEFINITIVE STATEMENTS OF PETER MARTYR'S EUCHARISTIC TEACHING	301

INTRODUCTION.

PETER MARTYR is known on the Continent chiefly through the historical theology of Schweizer and Heppe, and elsewhere only through his influence on 18th and 19th Century controversies in the Church of England, or through the 'Common Places' first set out by Massonius some fourteen years after Martyr's death. In his own day, however, he was a theologian of the first rank, acknowledged as not only a leading power in defensive polemic, but one who contributed largely to the positive Reformed theology, worthy to be placed beside Calvin in both respects. In approaching the study of his theology, therefore, it seemed necessary first to sketch his life's work, which is itself a testimony to his theological motive and power. Accordingly, the introductory 'Portrait' provides the historical setting for the main study.

Beginning the theological portion of this work with a quick plunge into the deep waters of the problem of analogy may seem a strange approach to the teaching of our Reformer. Yet the more one reads Peter Martyr the more one becomes convinced that his doctrine of analogy is the key to his entire theology. That for him 'analogy' implies 'sacrament' is the factor which sets the problem of this work, and explains why his doctrine of sacrament is the epitome of all his teaching. A further problem in this respect is that of translation. Except for a few letters, the only English translations are 16th Century, and often include interpretation in the body of the text, so that they are not trustworthy guides. This leaves us with the original Latin. It is excellent Latin, but involves certain moot points of rendition. We may mention two: that technical term

individuum vagum, which is virtually untranslatable, and which we have explained in terms of Martyr's own attitude to its context; and the word ratio which we have simply transliterated in most cases, since in his doctrine of analogy, "ratio" is what Martyr means by it. Here we must acknowledge the kind advice given us by Prof. J.H. Baxter of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, concerning problems of translation.

Finally, thanks are gratefully expressed to Dr. Lamb, Librarian at New College, Edinburgh; to the Librarians at St. Andrews and at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; and to those who assisted me at the Bodleian, the British Museum, Christchurch College, Oxford; the National Library of Scotland, Cambridge University Library, and by correspondence from Lambeth Palace and Canterbury Cathedral. Thanks are also due to Prof. N. Sykes of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, to Rev. Dr. G.W. Bromley of Edinburgh, and in connection with the question of certain problematic works of Martyr, and what MSS are extant, to Profs. F. Wendel of Strasbourg and J. Courvoisier of Geneva, and the Librarian of the University of Zürich. My debt to Prof. T.F. Torrance is manifold: he first introduced me to Peter Martyr, gave me new insight into Calvin's teaching upon sacrament and sacrifice, and by constant help and advice has enabled me to steer a somewhat consistent course through the mass of material at hand.

P O R T R A I T O F A N

E C U M E N I C A L R E F O R M E R

PORTRAIT OF AN ECUMENICAL REFORMER.

Tuscia te pepulit, Germania et Anglia fovit,
Martyr, quem extinctum, nunc tegit Helvetia
Dicere quae si vera volent, te et nomine dicent,
Hic fidus Christi (credite) *Martyr* erat.
Utque istae taceant, satis hoc tua scripta loquuntur:
Plus satis hoc Italīs exprobat exilium.

(Beza: Icones)

The Reformer whose history we shall briefly sketch, truly "belongs to all Protestant Europe".⁽¹⁾ He sprang from the Reformation in Italy; Calvin called him part of "the miracle of Italy"⁽²⁾ and Beza compared him to the phoenix, born of the ashes of Savonarola.⁽³⁾ But his chief work was performed on behalf of three great and pivotal cities in those critical times: Strassburg, Oxford and Zurich. His learning and his power in disputation and writing soon earned him a name respected by Reformer and Romanist alike. His relationship to the key figures of the Reformation, especially Bucer, Bullinger, Calvin and Cramer, and his influence upon the reformed teaching and order in the various spheres of his labour, are matters examined but little, although most worthy of detailed study. Here we shall simply attempt to sketch a portrait of the man, his life and teaching. Such a biographical introduction is necessary because his story is little known among us⁽⁴⁾ and because a knowledge of the contemporary background, and of the progress of his life and thought is essential to our presentation of his theology.

1. "L'homme dont nous présentons ici la biographie, appartient à toute l'Europe protestante"-C. Schmidt, Vie de Pierre Martyr Vermigli, Strassburg 1835, Intro. Hereafter, this work will be noted by the numeral I.
2. miraculum Italiae - Schmidt, I.1, source not given.
3. Icones, 1580: Petrum Martyrem honesta et locuplete Vermiliorum familia Florentiae natum, et e Savonarolae veluti cineribus prodeutem phoenicem ...
4. Nothing has appeared in English for over one hundred years. cf. Appendix B, which also gives the sources for this introductory Portrait.

I. VERMIGLI THE FLORENTINE - 1500-1526.

Stefano and Maria Vermigli of Florence had vowed to consecrate their expected child to Peter Martyr of Verona, killed in the Arian struggle in 1252⁽¹⁾, to whom a neighbouring chapel had been built. A son was born to them on September 8, 1500, and accordingly named Pietro Martire Vermigli.⁽²⁾

Peter Martyr was born into a household of wealth and social standing, so that a thorough education was early planned for him. His mother taught the boy Latin herself, chiefly the comedies of Terence. His formal studies began under Marcello Virgilio, among distinguished fellow-students, such as Piero Vettori. The boy Vermigli was soon noted for a quick understanding and an amazing memory, which combined with his love of study to foster that appetite for literature of every kind, so evident in his writings.

The question of a career was settled against his parents' wishes. Stefano had been deeply influenced by Savonarola,⁽³⁾ and suspected all monastic life of corruption and superstition. But his son considered that such a life offered time for the study he craved along with a relative freedom from temptation in self-dedication to God. Moreover at that time the Augustinian order was noted for its severity of discipline and thorough study of the Scriptures. Therefore at the age of sixteen, Vermigli entered the monastery of St. Augustine at Fiesole, near Florence. His

1. So the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique (ed. Vacant, Paris 1950, Tome Quinzième, Art. Vermigli) - Pierre de Vérone, martyr en 1252. But Simler had stated Petro Martyri Mediolanensi, and Young ('The Life and Times of Aonio Paleario', London, 1860, Vol. I., Chapter X; Peter Martyr Vermiglio) etc., following him, 'Peter Martyr of Milan', date unknown.
2. Not to be confused with Pietro Martire Angliera (1455-1525), noted chiefly for his Deus Epistolarum, a record of all manner of events of those days, when he lived in Spain.
3. Geronimo Savonarola (1452-1498) came to Florence in 1489, to the convent of St. Marc. In this city he preached fearlessly, condemning corruption in the state and in the Church, and was finally burned at the stake for his views. cf. McGrie, 'History of ... Reformation in Italy', London, 1833, pp 27-36; App. I contains specimens of his preaching.

only sister, Gemina Felicita, followed his example and entered the nunnery of S. Pietro Martire.

The three years at Fiesole were pleasant, particularly on account of the rich and extensive library gifted by the Medici, and including books from Egypt and Asia. Elocution was stressed, and the diligent study of Scripture involved the committing to memory of large portions of the text. Vermigli's progress here caused his superiors to send him for further study to a convent near Padua, where he might attend the University. Here he lived eight years, at the monastery of S. Giovanni di Verdaro, under the learned abbot Albert, almost wholly occupied in the study of philosophy and the humanities, and attending the lectures of Branda, Genua and Gonfalonieri. Branda dubbed him "our Florentine", and welcomed him to the public discussions which were the custom in those times. The chief study everywhere was Aristotle, who attracted Vermigli by his method and relative freedom from error. (1) Determining to read Aristotle in the original, despite the lack of Greek teachers, he and his close friend Cusano laboured through many nights until they mastered the language. Along with the philosophical and linguistic discipline, Vermigli studied scholastic theology under three professors, two Dominicans and an Eremit.

It was now Vermigli's twenty-sixth year, and the cloistered life of monk and scholar gave place to a career of public life which was to advance him in reputation and power, even to episcopal privileges, until his conversion to Reformed principles

1. In his Commentaries on Aristotle's Ethics (In Arist. Ethic. ad Nicomachum, Tiguri 1582), based on the lectures he gave at Strassburg during the years 1553-1556, Peter Martyr constantly examines Aristotle in the light of Scripture. He asks, whether a Christian can study philosophy (p 6) and replies that a philosophy intra limites is compatible with revelatory theology. Thus Aristotle's treatment of human felicitas is limited - and, he makes clear, positively qualified - by the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins, of which Aristotle was ignorant (p 181). Justification through Christ is stressed as the central Christian reality which marks off its subject matter from all philosophy: we place our felicity in reconciliatione cum Deo per Christum (p 266). Theology is responsive to the Word of God only: Discrimen hic mihi notetur inter Philosophiam moralem atque nostram Theologiam: illa facit analysim ad arbitrium sapientum ac bonorum virorum, nostra vero ad leges et sermones Dei (p 194)

made him an exile, the most famous Reformer to come forth from Italy.

II. HERESY IN HIGH PLACES - 1526-1542.

In 1526 Vermigli was elevated to the office of preacher. In those days the Dominican monks alone held the honour of preaching each Sunday, other orders preaching only during Advent and Lent. But the Augustinian order enjoyed special privilege from the Pope, and its preachers, chosen for their talents and eloquence, were honoured above all. Within the year, Vermigli received the degree D.D. from the University of Padua.

This office involved preaching at Brescia, then at Rome, Bologna, Venice, Mantua, Bergamo, Pisa and Montserrat. Meanwhile he taught the Scriptures in the convents of his order, and lectured on philosophy at Padua, Ravenna, Bologna and Vercelli, in the last named also teaching Greek and interpreting Homer, at Cusano's request.

Vermigli's preaching had followed his scholastic teaching, chiefly Thomas and Arimenes, although he had already some grounding in Patristics. But the new office forced him back behind the Fathers to the Scriptures themselves. For this purpose he determined to learn Hebrew. An appointment as vicar of the prior of his convent at Bologna gave opportunity to approach a Jewish physician for instruction. But he proved of little help, and once again Vermigli was left to the discipline of private study. Thus he mastered the new tongue, and indeed his knowledge of Hebrew earned him in later years the name of a leading Old Testament scholar, and the position of Professor in that field.

The abbacy of Spoletto was bestowed upon the young scholar and preacher - an unenviable position, for not only were the convents and monasteries under his charge noted for their luxury and vice, but the town itself was split by faction

and feud. Vermigli proved to be something new in abbots in that town, exerting every effort of admonition, example and discipline to reform the establishment. The results were startling, and soon the reformation spread to the townspeople, where Vermigli was able to reconcile the opposing factions and restore order and peace. Through these activities his reputation was enhanced among the people of Italy, while enmity grew in the hierarchy of the Church.

Light at Naples.

After three years Vermigli was made prior of a famous and wealthy benefice, S. Pietro ad Ara at Naples. This proved to be the decisive stage in his spiritual and theological awakening. Already becoming critical of the deformation of the Church through the rites and ceremonies of Rome, ⁽¹⁾ he now read authors who gave impetus and direction to this criticism. At that time in Italy certain works of the early Reformers were being circulated in translation, under pseudonyms. Vermigli read commentaries on the Gospels and on the Psalms by Arezzo Felino; two tracts by Abydenus Corallus on true and false religion, and on

-
1. The extent and significance of the Reformation in Italy is perhaps greater than commonly realised. The struggle for freedom and truth is symbolized by many great names; Schmidt mentions Dante, Tasse, Machiavelli and Savonarola; Fanini and Carneseca; Vermigli, Zanchi, Ochino and Lelio Socin (exiled); and Giordano Bruno and Vico (I. Intro). of M. Young's work, a detailed study of this whole movement for Reformation (op.cit.); Thos. McCrie's 'History of the ... Reformation in Italy' (Edinburgh 1833); T.M. Lindsay's 'A History of the Reformation' (Edinburgh 1908), Vol. II, vi.3. We might mention particularly the influence of the Oratory of Divine Love and its kindred associations. This society included men like Contarini, Caraffa Sadoletto and also Reginald Pole who left England to seek such association of piety and study. The accession of Paul III (1534) brought a new era of self-criticism - the new Cardinals, all members of the Oratory drafted in 1537-8 a "scathing indictment of the condition of the Roman Church" (Lindsay, loc.cit.) of Kidd, 'Documents of the Cont. Ref.', p 307: Consilium ... de emendanda ecclesia.) This was the background against which Vermigli broke from Rome.

providence; a well-known work, principi della theologia, di Imposilo de terra negra; and some writings of Erasmus. (1)

Others in Naples were searching the Scriptures too, notably Vermigli's friend Cusano, and the poet Marc'Antonio Flaminio. But most important, "Naples was the favoured place where the glad tidings of the Gospel were first heard in Italy at the period of the Reformation", the chief instrument in this proclamation being Juan Valdes. (2) Valdes gathered about him a select group of the leading people in Church and State in Naples - then a kingdom ruled by Charles V through a viceroy - and set before them the rediscovered Gospel. In this group were accounted as three chief disciples, Vermigli, Ochino and Flaminio. (3)

Valdes stressed justification by faith and the work of the Holy Spirit, and expounded I Corinthians to the private gatherings. Vermigli had meanwhile become

1. These were: In quatuor evangelia enarrationes, 1527, and Sacrorum Psalmorum libri quinque, 1529, by Martin Bucer (Aretium Felinum); de vera et falsa religione and de providentia Dei by Zwingli; the loci Theologici of Melancthon (terra negra!); I have not been able to determine the work of Erasmus which Vermigli read at this period. cf Simler, Young (p 403), Schmidt (I. p 12), Schlosser, Leben des Peter Martyr Vermigli (Heidelberg, 1809, pp 379f).
2. (Young, p 201). Valdes left Spain about 1529, by which time the Inquisition suspected him of heresy because of his Aviso sobre los interpretes de la sagrada Escritura, based largely on Tauler's Christian Institutions. He became secretary to Toledo, Neapolitan viceroy. cf Young's excellent summary of the Valdes brothers, pp 201-238; McCrie, op.cit., pp 134ff.
3. Bernardino Ochino, Capuchin monk and famous preacher of Italy, became Capuchin-general, suspect for his teachings, and finally fled Italy with Vermigli. Later went to England with Vermigli, then to the Italian Church at Zürich. Unfortunately the end of his life brought the tragedy of heterodoxy (after Vermigli's death), and he became a wandering exile, finally dying of the plague in 1566. Young has a detailed survey of his life and work, op.cit. Ch. IX; cf. McCrie, op.cit.

confident that Rome had deformed the Gospel chiefly on the doctrines of grace and atonement, and began the exposition of I Corinthians at S. Pietro ad Ara. This would be about 1535-1536. Valdes died in 1536, by which time all Italy, and especially the Neapolitan district, was stirring with seeds of reformation. The inevitable opposition was growing: in Naples this came chiefly from the Theatin monks, who began suggesting that Vermigli's teaching was heretical. They were assisted in their plans to oust him by Rebibba, vicar of Naples, later Cardinal of Pisa.

Vermigli's lectures were attended by many distinguished persons, and several bishops. When he treated of I Corinthians 3, 11-13, he suggested that the Fathers did not apply the "fire" to purgatory, but referred the whole sentence to the doctrine of justification through Christ. This so angered the opposing faction that Toledo forbade him to preach. Vermigli refused and appealed to the Pope. His friends at Rome, notably Contarini and Pole, had the prohibition removed, and he resumed his activities.

II Visitatore.

Before he had completed his three years at Naples, Vermigli became severely ill of a fever then raging, of which Cusano died. In 1539 his superiors made him visitor general of his order, an office which involved visitation throughout Italy, with great powers of discipline. His zeal in this office⁽¹⁾ extended not only to correcting such abuses as sprang from the monastic luxury and immorality, but even to attacking the stronghold of abuse in the hierarchy itself. With the sanction of Cardinal Gonzaga, protector of the order, he banished the rector-general and several companions, their punishment being perpetual imprisonment on the island

1. of Schlosser, op.cit. p 383 - "Martyrs Eifer für Recht und Wahrheit" in this office.

of Diomedes. For this rigour Vermigli's honour was considerably enhanced, and soon he was raised to further dignity.

Crisis at Lucca.

In 1541 Vermigli was named prior of S. Frediano at Lucca - a most significant office, since it conferred episcopal authority over one half the city. Vermigli's task here was no easy one, for Lucca held towards Florence a deep hatred, as the city which had deprived it of freedom.⁽¹⁾ But "our Florentine" gained the friendship of all, and soon laid plans for a twofold reformation, of discipline and learning. He stressed the education of the young, in the public schools, and for the college procured such lecturers that St. Fridian's was surely the brightest gathering in Romanism. Paolo Lacisio of Verona taught Latin; Count Celso Martinengo, Greek; and Emanuelo Tremellio, a converted Jew, Hebrew. All three ultimately left Italy for the cause of Reformation, Lacisio becoming Professor of Greek at Strasburg; Martinengo, pastor of the Italian Church in Geneva; and Tremellio, Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge and then Heidelberg.

Vermigli himself maintained a heavy schedule, giving each day an exposition on the Pauline Epistles in Latin, and on a Psalm each evening before supper to the whole community, besides preaching in Italian every Sunday to the public. During Advent and Lent he followed the old custom of reading the Gospels with running comments. Under such instruction there gradually emerged a reformed congregation in Lucca, which was a living example of the power of the Gospel

1. Young, p 407, attributes Vermigli's election to this office partly to the enmity of those who thought such an adverse situation would cause him harm.

until the Inquisition finally succeeded in crushing out its life,⁽¹⁾ and a monastery from which eighteen monks followed Vermigli from Italy on behalf of the Reformation.

In 1541 Charles V and Pope Paul III met at Lucca. Cardinal Contarini, whose dealings at Ratisbon had brought charges of heresy from the hierarchy, visited the Pope at Lucca to defend himself. He stayed with his friend Vermigli in the monastery, along with Tommaso Badia, Master of the Sacred Palace. This visit is a further important influence upon Vermigli's progress, since Contarini's first-hand account of the opinions of Bucer, Melancthon and the other Reformers helped to crystallize his thoughts.

By this time Vermigli was under definite suspicion, which was confirmed by the clergy attached to the Papal visit. Bishop Guidiccioni wrote on June 22, 1542, to the municipality of Lucca warning of the spread of heretical opinions. One month later, a further letter from Rome - where the tribunal of Inquisition had been erected⁽²⁾ specifically mentions certain men who should be arrested, including the vicar "of whom we hear for certain that he has given the communion several times to many of our citizens, teaching them to partake only in remembrance of the sufferings of Christ, and not because they believed that this wafer contained his most holy body".⁽³⁾ In August the Inquisition struck, and measures were taken

-
1. cf Young, pp 419 and 575 concerning the Sommario di Storia Lucchese: charges of la diffusione della luterane dottrine caused the authorities themselves to take measures to forbid correspondence with heretics (such as Vermigli?) and to burn all reformed books; and McGrie, op.cit., pp 285-289, for their contribution to the Genevan Church and State. In 1547 Florence confiscated all heretical books, "particularly those of Ochino and Martyr" (McGrie, p 291)
 2. Cardinal Caraffa, afterwards Pope Paul IV, is notable in this work - cf McGrie, op.cit., Ch. V.
 3. "non gia perche credino che in quell' ostia vi sia il suo santissimo corpo," quoted by Young, p. 410. His work is the best for the Italian period of Vermigli's life.

to trap Vermigli himself. Secret letters to Rome, plots within St. Fridian's convents, rebellion against the discipline of the order, spies to determine his movements and literary sources, all characterize this beginning of the end. His enemies called a meeting at Genoa, inviting him to attend. But realising the true nature of this gathering, which was but a trap for his special benefit, he yielded to the advice of his friends and chose to leave Lucca. (1) He gave part of his extensive library to Cristofor Brenta, a noble of Lucca, with orders to forward the books to Germany at the earliest opportunity; the remainder he left to the monastery. He then handed over his charge to the vicar, and left the city, accompanied by Lacisio, Theodosio Trebellio and his attendant Guilio Terenziano, the beloved "Julius" who was with him to the end of his life.

"Flee Ye Into Another"

Vermigli and his friends went first to Pisa, where he hid for a short time. A noteworthy occurrence during this visit is his meeting in secret with certain nobles and Christian friends, to whom he dispensed the Lord's Supper after the simple manner of the Gospel record. He also gave two letters to be delivered later, one addressed to Cardinal Pole, his superior, and the other to his friends

1. cf Young, p 412, quoting Caracciolo, (Vita di Paolo IV) "In quella città teneva scuola Pietro Martire ... Tremellio ... Martinengo ... Lacisio ... Zanahio tutti pessimi heretici ... Questi hebbe fra Pietro Martire Vermigli che infettò Napoli, Firenze, e tutta l'Inghilterra".

at Lucca.⁽¹⁾ In these he declared the errors and abuses of Romanism, and especially its monastic system, "with which he could no longer have conversation with a safe conscience" (Simler). He also mentioned the snares laid by his enemies, and reminded his people of the sincerity of his faith, lamenting the fact that he was unable to instruct them more fully in the truth. He returned the ring which was the badge of his office.

From Pisa he went to friends at Florence, and there met Bernardino Ochino,

1. There is some discrepancy about the events of this period, revolving round Vermigli's Semplice Dichiarazione or Catechism. This was published at Basle in 1544, in Italian, but there is no reason to think that it is an earlier work, or played a material part in his Italian period. Yet Schlosser identifies the pastoral letter (Hirtenbrief) written from Pisa in 1542, with the Catechism: "Dieser in Form einer Exposition des apostolischen Symbolums abgefasste Absagebrief der catholischer Religion ist eigentlich in Italienischer Sprache geschnaben" (p 392). Schmidt had also thought that the Catechism was first circulated in Italy: "Avant de quitter a jamais l'Italie, Martyr y publia encore une profession de foi, sous la forme d'une explication du symbole apostolique" (I.16), but corrected this opinion in his subsequent work of 1858 (Peter Martyr Vermigli. Leben und Ausgewählte Schriften. Elberfeld - hereafter cited by the numeral II). There (p 37) he relates it to the earlier letter from Pisa thus: "es ist Vermigli's erstes auf uns gekommenes Werk, ein Absagebrief vom Papstthum ... Da er auf der Flucht keine Bücher bei sich hatte und Eile nöthig war, hat er nur kurz seine Ansichten dargelegt". The New Schaff-Herzog Enc. of Rel. Kn., Art. Vermigli, makes the same error: "He issued his first Evangelical tract, Una semplice dichiarazione ... for which he was summoned before the chapter of his order in Genoa". The actual order of his writings, therefore, would be: from Pisa, the "Pastoral letter" to Lucca, and the "Letter of refusal of the Papacy" - Simler's summary of their contents is the basis for all accounts of these; from Strasburg, the Epistle to the Faithful of the Church at Lucca (Locì Communes, Londini 1583, p 1071 - hereafter this will be cited as L.C.) in Jan. 25, 1543, and the Semplice Dichiarazione of 1544.

who faced the same choice as he. They agreed, on the basis of Matthew 10.23⁽¹⁾ to choose the freedom of exile. Ochino departed for Geneva, and two days later Vermigli set out. Travelling by way of Bologna, Ferrara and Verona, he was welcomed everywhere, and finally entered Switzerland, haven of refugees from Romanism, stopping at Zürich. Here he was welcomed by Henry Bullinger, Conrad Pellican and Rodolph Gualter. These were to become his closest friends, and although he would gladly have stayed there if there had been an office vacant, this desire was not to be fulfilled until the death of Pellican in 1556. In the Oration delivered at that time, he said: "To Zürich I began to take my way ... those two days when I stayed here with those who accompanied me, I was so delighted with the godly, learned and pleasant conversation which I had with Dr. Bullinger, Bibliander, Gualther and Pellican of happy memory, and others whom I cannot now mention, that I accounted those blessed, who might live with such men, and rejoiced myself for my own present exile, by which I was brought by Almighty God to that consolation, and the knowledge and conversation of such men, nor ever afterwards, believe me, could I forget this Church, those two days, and that fellowship".⁽²⁾

Vermigli's next stop was Basle, where he resided for a month until he was

1. "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another" - cf Vermigli's interpretation of this text in his De Fuga in Persecutione, (L.C. 1073). This is in the form of an Epistle "to a certain friend", date unknown, and written in Italian originally. In this Epistle he teaches that Christ's precept in Matt. 10.23 is perpetual; and that "flight taken for such causes is a kind of confession". Among the "causes" treated, he insists on a freedom from fear of a false kind (fear per se is not evil). The argument is twofold: whether the fear of death in a Christian is sin; and whether Christ's precept holds today. The R.C., Laing (De Vita et Moribus ... Haereticorum, Paris 1581, fol. 26B) writes of Vermigli and Ochino, optimum rati sunt se conferre Genevam omnium haereticorum miserrimam speluncam.
2. Oratio quam Tiguri primam habuit cum in locum D. Conradi Pellicani successisset - L.C. 1063

invited to Strassburg by Paolo Lacisio who had preceded him. Here he met Martin Bucer, through whose influence he was appointed Professor of Theology, after Capito's death, in December, 1542.

III. THE FIRST STRASSBURG PERIOD : December, 1542-October, 1547.

Once settled in Strassburg, Peter Martyr's⁽¹⁾ first thought was for his flock at Lucca. On January 25, 1543,⁽²⁾ he wrote to "the faithful of the Church at Lucca, saints by calling", informing them of his call to Strassburg.

On our arrival we were most lovingly received by Bucer into his house, and remained with him seventeen days. His dwelling seemed to be a home of hospitality, he is so accustomed to entertain strangers who travel for the Gospel and the cause of Christ. He governs his house so well that in all these days I could not once perceive any cause of offence, but found many occasions of edification. At his table there is no appearance of excess or niggardliness, but only a godly moderation: here there is no distinction of meats. Before and after meat something is recited out of the Holy Scriptures to minister matter of godly and holy communications. I may boldly affirm that I ever went from that table a wiser man ... Bucer was continually occupied by daily sermons, governing the church, seeing that the curates watched over souls and confirming them by holy examples; he visited also the schools of learning to see that all labour had reference to the furtherance of the Gospel, exhorting and stirring up the magistrate to christian godliness. For this purpose he daily attended the courts of justice. Being thus fully occupied during the day, he takes the night for his private studies and prayers. I never awaked out of sleep but I found him awake ... Behold, well-beloved, brethren, in our age bishops upon the earth, or rather in the church of Christ, who are truly holy ... Bucer obtained for me from the senate the Professorship of theology, and hath committed to me the charge of a daily interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, with an honorable stipend by which I can maintain myself. At this present time I interpret the lesser prophets as they used to call them, being now at the end of Amos; and because the greater number in this school know something of Hebrew, I expound the Hebrew text in Latin.

-
1. After he left Italy, the name of Vermigli was little used, except in the formal titles of his published works. He is known as "Peter Martyr" or simply "Martyr" to friends and enemies alike.
 2. octavo calendas Ianuarias - L.C., p 1071; Schlosser (p 400) cites its date as January 1, and its origin as Basle, and Young cites Jan. 6 (p 415) but reproduces the correct date in his quotation of the letter (p 418). Young gives the whole letter, pp 415-418.

The letter also expresses his trust that the Holy Spirit will continue to teach the people at Lucca. He discusses the question of flight and persecution:

You will perhaps say you should have continued, waited until the most imminent dangers had actually come upon you and suffered them with a patient mind, which in the end would have greatly furthered the building up of the Church ... but time and necessity are revealed to those who in adversity wholly commit themselves to God's protection. I was so persuaded that the right moment for me to depart was come, that I doubt not this persuasion was inspired by God. Although by my departure I avoided some bitter troubles, yet I did not escape entirely free. At Naples I suffered great vexation, and also in your city. You yourselves know what anxiety and torment I endured the last year. These, though not to be called grievous calamities, were yet the messengers and tokens of them. It seems to me that I have not preached the Gospel without afflictions. I did not therefore refuse to provide for my safety: while I am here I am by God's grace of some use.

Moreover, he continues, think of the "variety of superstitions" he had to contend because of his office, requiring others as well to share in things "contrary both to my judgment and conscience". Is not his flight itself a witness to his motive?

To say the truth, my departure - I say this as setting forth the glory of God - when duly considered, carries with it no small mortification of self, the loss of honours and promotion, wherewith in the sight of man I was largely endowed, and of many comforts with which I was surrounded, besides the laying down of an authority which gave me both power and influence over men. All these things I might have increased in many ways, if I would have departed from the truth of God and of the Gospel.

A second Italian writing which is preserved for us is the work on the Apostle's Creed already mentioned. This was published in February, 1544, and reveals the mature thought and precise style which was to characterize all his works. It was a "profession of the heavenly and divine wisdom" (una professione di celeste anzi divina sapienza), and exhibits those basic reformed principles which determined Martyr's future teaching and work.⁽¹⁾

1. Its teaching will be considered in Chap. 3, etc.

The Strassburg Lectures.

Peter Martyr's lectures during this period are significant both in their method and subject-matter. Simler tells us that he began with Lamentations and the Minor Prophets, and then began the Pentateuch, completing Genesis, Exodus and a good part of Leviticus before he left Strassburg for England.⁽¹⁾ His method of exposition was, first to set forth the literal sense of the text, for which his linguistic knowledge fitted him admirably, while comparing obscure places of Scripture with clear; then he would comment on the deeper significance and the practical application. Simler says that he observed two special points, "an exact method and a pure and plain style". Schlosser indicates the historical significance of his method: "As for his lectures, it is true that they were not strictly exegetical; but if one considers who the people were that attended, one will easily see that a precise exegetical lecture, explaining only the literal meaning would have been of little or no use here. Priests, monks and laymen, who either wished only to be instructed in the new teaching and its arguments, or desired to act as teachers themselves, crowded from every side to the renowned Teacher, and wished to find here the spirit and eloquence they missed from their teachers. Hence also Martyr's habit of dwelling on side issues and commenting on the Fathers, while he explained the Scriptures. His fame soon spread through the whole of Europe".⁽²⁾

The Patristic influence upon his teaching involves an important question: his relationship to Martin Bucer. This first Strassburg period was undoubtedly the decisive phase for Martyr's theology, for in England he was immediately put on

1. Of these lectures the following are extant: commentaries on Lamentations and Genesis, Propositions from Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus (L.C. 999) cf Appendix A.
2. op.cit. p 410. From the published works it is evident that this "deeper meaning" of the scopus of Scripture was for Martyr the Christological orientation of all Scripture, including the Old Testament. This will concern us in Chap. 2.

the defensive and from that time until his death was engaged in drawing out the implications of his doctrine in the face of a variety of opponents. Simler tells us that he declared "with a singular happiness of memory, of what opinion were the Fathers", and Strype records an interesting fact: Bartlet Green, one of Martyr's Oxford students and a martyr in Mary's reign, quoted Martyr as saying that while he was a papist, he had not read Chrysostom on I Corinthians 10, but later "he was contented to yield to those doctors, having first humbled himself in prayer, desiring God to illuminate him, and bring him to the true understanding of the Scripture". (1) We have seen that his education at Padua had given "an acquaintance with the writings of the fathers" (Simler), while his refutation of the doctrine of purgatory in the famous lecture at Naples was based on Patristic teaching. (2) But there is little doubt that his thorough knowledge of the Fathers as the formative source of his theology, owes a great deal to his close friendship with Bucer in these years. (3)

A contrast is offered between Martyr and Bucer during this early period of his Reformed teaching. Martyr's methodical and precise style of lecturing contrasted favourably with Bucer's often inconsistent treatment of themes and irrelevancy of data, until, Simler tells us he was soon "considered to excel Bucer".

-
1. Ecclesiastical Memorials ... John Strype, London 1816, Vol. II, p 197. Strype adds that this was probably while he was in Italy or immediately afterwards.
 2. His Commentary ad loc. cites especially Chrysostom and Augustine, but this was based on lectures at Oxford and therefore is not conclusive about his authorities for the early period.
 3. This question is dealt with in Appendix D. Calvin had left Strassburg in 1541, and no doubt experienced a similar influence from the side of Bucer.

Such an estimate speaks volumes, for "Bucer was so highly esteemed at Strassburg that a higher eulogium could not be passed on Martyr, than to equal him to this worthy divine; but in method and logical precision he was considered his superior: he owed this probably to the close study of Aristotle so much practised in Italy".⁽¹⁾

Peter Martyr's precise method and the use of unambiguous terms brought him into conflict with Bucer. Simler states "He judged that a darkness of speech and ambiguity of words, is the cause of very many contentions. And of this his writings give a clear testimony. For he wrote many things about the justification of man, and not little about God's predestination, but indeed he wrote most of all about the Lord's Supper. In the explication of this, many learned men use a certain affected obscurity, but in his writings there is nothing read, but that which is proper, plain and manifest". But Bucer, passionate apostle of unity, had taken a different path about this central doctrine of the Lord's Supper. His opinion was that terms could well be used which allowed of interpretation by extreme Lutheran or extreme Zwinglian. And at the Diet of Ratisbon in 1541, he and Melancthon, stirred by the great hope then entertained of unity and peace, were tempted to allow vagueness of explanation to cover differences in basic doctrines. At the beginning of Martyr's residence in Strassburg, Bucer persuaded him to follow this custom. But Martyr quickly saw that the "grosser kind" of view involved a carnal interpretation of the terms used in the teaching of the Lord's Supper, offending the weaker brethren by such doubtful speech, and refused to share in such manner of teaching. Schlosser describes him as "moved to passion" on this issue, because Bucer's "principles concerning the pious fraud, and the end which justifies the means" contradicted Christian morality.⁽²⁾ Simler tells us that this break

1. Young, p 421. cf Dict. de Theol. Cath. (ed Vacant), Art. Vermigli: "Il y a resta cinq ans, très goûté et considéré comme un émule de Bucer".

2. op.cit. p 409 - in fairness we should mention that Schlosser appears to be a thorough Calvinist, with little liking for Bucer or Cramer.

indicated no disagreement in doctrine - "although the manner of their teaching was diverse, yet was there a full consent of both in all the doctrine of religion, and a perpetual conjunction of life".

'The Story of Catherine Vermilius'

At first, Peter Martyr had lived with his Italian friends in Strassburg; but his friends persuaded him to marry, a step which converted monks were then encouraged to take as proof of their sincerity. Catherine Dammartin of Metz, "a lover of true religion", became his wife. This would be in 1545, since she died on February 15, 1553 and Simler says the marriage lasted eight years. A most striking but deplorable tragedy attaches to the subsequent history of this woman. She died in England and was buried near the tomb of St. Frideswyde at Oxford. During the Marian persecution, Cardinal Pole, once Martyr's friend and member of the liberal Italian group, but now captain of the heresy-hunters in England, advised that her body should be exhumed because of its proximity to the remains of the Saint. This reason was an afterthought, since no one would accuse this lady of beloved memory, of heresy. Accordingly, the body was removed from its resting-place, and cast upon the dungheap in the stables of Marshall, dean of Christchurch. (1) This was about the same time that similar charges and abuse were carried out on the remains of Bucer and Fagius at Cambridge, in 1556. After Elizabeth's accession in 1558, an ecclesiastical commission, composed of Parker,

-
1. Ut, quoniam juxta corpus sanctissimae Fridesuidae jacebat corpus Catharinae uxoris Petri Martyris, exhumari et jactari faciat - quoted by Young, p 443, from the document which relates the whole affair, Historia vera: item Catharinae Vermiliae, D. Petri Martyris Vermilij castiss. atque piissimae coniugis, exhumatae, eiusdemq. ad honestam sepulturam restitutae. 1562. (cf Ant. a Wood's Historia et antiquit. universitatis Oxoniensis, Oxonii 1674).

Grindal and Goodrich, all personal friends of Martyr, supervised an investigation of the whole affair, which culminated in the reintering of Catherine, in a common grave with the relics of the Saint, to do away with the superstitious practice of exposing the relics for adoration, and to preserve the remains of Martyr's wife from future insult. A speech on the occasion ended with the words, Hic requiescit Religio cum Superstitione.

'Come over and help us'

Peter Martyr's last years at Strassburg were darkened by the shadow cast by the approaching Interim⁽¹⁾ from which even Bucer himself, who had such a hand in the original plan, was forced to flee. Although the Interim was not ratified until May, 1548, and Bucer did not leave Strassburg until March, 1549, yet the coming victory of Romanism caused an intensity of opposition against Bucer and

-
1. The Augsburg Interim and Confession played a large part in Martyr's relationship with Strassburg. Melancthon in 1530 had drawn up a Confession (first an 'Apology' based on the Schwabach Articles, the Lutheran view of the decisions reached at Marburg in 1529). But at the Diet of Augsburg the Confession provoked discussion but not acceptance; the Diet ended by embodying a policy of enforced conformity in its 'Recess'. The Schmalkaldic League was therefore formed by all Protestants for protection; and the Peace of Nürnberg was the result, 1532. But after Luther's death in 1546, Charles V again sought concord by drawing up the 'Interim of Augsburg', a compromise backed by the sword, May 15, 1548. Bucer's influence had till now been a real force; but the Interim was a Romanist-Lutheran impossibility. Finally after strife and pressure, a similarly ambiguous settlement was effected, the 'Peace of Augsburg', Sept. 25, 1555. Lutheranism but not Calvinism had obtained recognition. This is the background against which Martyr's first and second Strassburg residences are to be viewed. cf Kidd, op.cit. pp 245-364 for documents cited.

Martyr which made Archbishop Crammer's invitation doubly acceptable.⁽¹⁾ At King Henry VIII's death, his son was proclaimed King Edward VI, on January 31, 1547. The young King's advisers, Somerset, the Protector and Crammer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, were desirous of a thorough reformation. To accomplish this purpose, it was agreed that learned and godly foreigners should be invited to come to England, particularly to teach at the great Universities. The two principal Reformers who were thus invited by Crammer and who became a great influence upon the English Reformation, were Peter Martyr, who came to Oxford in 1547, and Martin Bucer, to Cambridge in 1549. Strype says, "It was especially thought necessary, that the corrupt opinions about the Eucharist should be rectified in the universities as well as elsewhere; and both these foreigners thought aught in this great point, though differing in their judgments in the expressions to be used about them".⁽²⁾ Therefore in November, 1547, Martyr was granted leave by the Senate at Strassburg, and began his journey to England.

1. Schmidt (II p 72) dates Martyr's Prayer from Psalm 55 as written at this period; it suits perhaps the second Strassburg period better, when the strife with the Lutheran faction, so recently brethren, was becoming so intense that it declared as enemies Martyr's friend John a Lasco and Martyr himself, who left Strassburg on its account. The prayer reads, in part: "We are forced (O most good and merciful God) by reason of the extreme and urgent distress of the Church, to cry out daily unto thee ... deliver us (for thy infinite mercies' sake) from subtle words and deceitful devices, and have a great foresight that thy holy Church be not sore plagued with them, who seem sometime greatly to favour her, and were partakers in the same with us, of the most pleasant and sweet food of thy blessed Sacraments... Let not the league be broken which those have who are at one with thee... sustain and increase this our feeble and slender hope with thy most present and ready help, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen." (Preces Sacrae ex Psalmis Davidis ... Tiguri, 1564)

2. op.cit., p 196

He was accompanied by Bernardino Ochino, who had also accepted an invitation from Crammer, and who was also to play an important role in England. ⁽¹⁾

Martyr was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at the University of Oxford, and Ochino, a Canon of Canterbury, with dispensation of residence.

IV. A REFORMER AT OXFORD : November, 1547-October, 1553.

Crammer warmly welcomed the Italian Reformers, entertaining them at Lambeth for some time. ⁽²⁾ Peter Martyr describes his twofold task:

Indeed I took upon myself a weighty charge. For it was necessary to teach Theology in the University of Oxford, but also I was often called to convocations held at London about ecclesiastical matters. ⁽³⁾

Strype states: "The Italian stranger, Peter Martyr, was designed to read divinity in Oxford, whither he repaired from the archbishop's, fortified by the king's authority: but, after a little time, very rudely treated and opposed there by a popish party. Yet, notwithstanding these oppositions and discouragements of Peter Martyr, the king's learned professor here at Oxford, he steadily went on in the business committed to his trust; and besides his public lectures, he sometimes preached at St. Mary's, and had his private lectures, and his private sermons, in Italian, at his house: whereunto resorted many auditors." ⁽⁴⁾ But the outstanding event of his Oxford days was the famous Disputation held in 1549.

-
1. There is extant (MSS Ashmole 826, Oxford; given in full in Young, pp576f) an interesting document entitled "Expences of the Journey of Peter Martyr and Bernerdinus Ochino to England in 1547", by one John Abell, and containing such diverse purchases as works of the Fathers for Martyr, two daggers, and "a peticote, glovys, and nyght cap for Julius".
 2. Strype (Memorials of Crammer, p 466) suggests that Martyr stayed "till the winter was pretty well over", not beginning lectures before March or April.
 3. Zürich Oration (Oratio quam Tiguri ... L.C. 1063).
 4. Ecc. Mem. II, 336

The Oxford Disputation of 1549.

In view of the state of religion in the country at that time, which was deteriorating through the activity of the Romanists, notably Stephen Gardiner and Richard Smith, and through the ignorance of the common people, Martyr at once began to lecture on I Corinthians, as containing matter suitable to the needs of the day. In the Dedication to Edward VI of the published lectures, ⁽¹⁾ he gives his reason for undertaking the explication of this particular Epistle:

But that was the chief cause of this purpose, that nowhere else are treated such varied and multiple heads, which make to the controversies of our times. Undoubtedly by the doctrine of this Epistle, if skilfully and fitly used, we could easily heal completely all the faults by which the soundness of the Church is corrupted.

During the lectures of 1548 Peter Martyr was left alone by the Romanist party, even when he attacked the doctrine of celibacy. But a crisis was precipitated by his exposition of I Corinthians 10, 16-17. ⁽²⁾ A clamour was immediately raised, headed by Smith, who claimed that Martyr ridiculed the traditional doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and treated holy things with contempt. ⁽³⁾

-
1. The Commentaries on I Corinthians given at Oxford were published at Zürich in 1562, and a second edition in 1572, from which this quotation is taken.
 2. Simler says simply "upon occasion of the Apostle's words, he began to treat of the Lord's Supper". Young, p 428, locates this at I Corinthians 11.26. But in Martyr's published Commentary, 10.16 is the critical verse, where the key word benedictio introduces the problem of the Romanist consecratio and subsequent contention that se Christum ipsum sacrificare. Moreover, immediately following 10. 16-17 is the Treatise An in Communionem Liceat Una Tantum Specie Uti, suggesting that at this point Martyr thought a frontal attack on Romanism was in order. Finally, in Chapter 11, it is verse 24 which concerns him most, where there occurs the Hoc est corpus meum. Young is often biased by his simple dialectic of 'Roman or Zwinglian' and classes Martyr's views as the latter: "a commemoration of the death of Christ".
 3. cf Schlosser, p 423: up to this point, Martyr's moderation had kept quiet "even the most intolerant Richard Smith, D.T., who had likewise attended his lectures".

The party posted notices in the Oxford Churches, announcing a public debate the next day, in which Martyr "would dispute openly against the presence of the body of Christ in the Holy Supper" (Simler). Needless to say, Martyr knew nothing of such a disputation! Yet the warning of his friends, the dangerous nature of the crowd that gathered that following day, even the thrusting into his hands of a challenge from Smith as he walked to the lecture, did not deter him from his accustomed routine.

At the lecture he announced that he had come "not to dispute, but to read" and forthwith began to speak. The adversaries maintained silence during the lecture, which, Simler tells us, was delivered with his usual calmness and clarity. But at the close the people clamoured for disputation. Martyr stated that he was not prepared, especially since he had not seen the propositions drawn up by the challenger. He refused to enter into so weighty a matter without the King's knowledge.⁽¹⁾ Moreover, a valid disputation required definite questions agreed upon by both parties, the presence of Judges and Moderators, and the appointing of clerks to record the debate - these things Martyr spoke from his long experience in public disputations, which began at Padua. At this point Richard Cox, Chancellor, dismissed the crowd and ordered Martyr and Smith to come to his house and arrange a formal debate, taking Martyr's arm to guide him through the crowd.

-
1. Strype notes (op.cit. pp 130f) that on December 27, 1548, an Act of Parliament forbade open disputation about the sacrament, or enquiring into such questions as "Whether the body and blood of Christ was there really or figuratively, locally or circumscriptively ..." and advised that Paul's words be sufficient for all, "The bread is the communion, or partaking, of the body of Christ, and the wine, likewise, the partaking of the blood of Christ". This was to be "until the king, with the advice of his council and clergy of the realm, should set forth an open doctrine thereof, and what terms and words may justly be spoken thereby".

Peter Martyr's demands in drawing up the propositions are worthy of note. He states them in the prefatory speech made at the Disputation.⁽¹⁾ He wishes to reverse Aristotle's order of first determining the being, then the manner and purpose of a thing, since

neither of us doubts that there is a body of Christ ... Some conjunction is there of the body and blood of Christ with the signs, on which both sides agree; but of what kind of conjunction it is stands the controversy.

Accordingly, Martyr wishes to state three manners of conjunction as the grounds of the disputation. But in the use of terms he prefers the words corporeally and carnally to really and substantially (corporaliter, carnaliter; realiter, substantialiter) -

But why I derived adverbs from the nouns flesh and body, rather than from thing and substance, is in order that I might accommodate myself to holy scripture, which in mentioning a sacrament, does not have the names of thing and substance, but only of body, flesh and blood; and therefore have I written, corporeally and carnally.

A further point is this, that the error of attributing too much to the sacraments is as serious as their neglect - "both of which extremes we have always to our power avoided". To deny a carnal presence, then, is not - as the Papists say - to conclude, "it follows of necessity, that there is nothing left in the sacrament but a signification". For they are then Anabaptists! The truth is that Christ is present "by a sacramental conjunction, which is a most

1. of his Epistle to the Christian Reader, introducing his written account of the Disputation: there are two reasons why he now sets forth in writing this and the Treatise ("of the same matter, for its clearer declaring"): the slanders of evil men, who have everywhere claimed victory in this affair, and have publicly abused his name; and the desires of friends and superiors to which he now yields. The Disputatio and Tractatio were published as one volume at Oxford in 1549.

effectual signification".⁽¹⁾ Accordingly, the propositions for debate were drawn up:

1. In the sacrament of the Eucharist, there is no transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.
2. The body and blood of Christ is not carnally and corporeally in the bread and wine; nor, as others say, under the shows of bread and wine.
3. The body and blood of Christ is sacramentally joined to the bread and the wine.

The date fixed for the Disputation was May 4. But Smith's genius for raising a tumult did not extend to such matters, and he quickly disappeared to St. Andrew's, and then to Louvain.⁽²⁾ On May 17, Martyr posted on the door of St. Mary's Church a notice, stating:⁽³⁾

of Appendix E, where an extended quotation from Martyr's written Preface to the Disp. and Tract, is given. This is an important document in the problem of the influence of Bucer upon Martyr, which is dealt with in App. D. Martyr's explicit use of the words "effectual signification", as well as his frequent insistence upon the real presence of Christ to faith, in the Disputation, indicate that Bucer's fears were influenced more by the enemy's demands than by Martyr's theology. Smith is a model of inconstancy. He was Fellow of Merton College and Principal of St. Alban's, Oxford, and in 1535, Regius Professor of Divinity - succeeded by Martyr. Even at that time he was "giddy and unstable" and of "a profligate conscience" as Strype (*op.cit.* p 71) illustrates as follows. Latimer one day was in Oxford and attended Smith's lecture. Smith spoke on justification by faith alone. The next day he revoked the lecture, asserting the contrary doctrine, and acknowledging that he had spoken out of fear "and praying, that they would attribute it to his youth; at that time plucking off his cap, whereby every one saw his grey hairs, which caused laughter". In 1546 he published "A Defence of the Sacrifice of the Mass", and on May 15, 1547 made a public retractation at St. Paul's Cross, London, and later at Oxford. At Louvain he published two books against Martyr, one on justification, to which Martyr makes references in his Treatise De Iustificatione, in the Commentary on Romans; and one on Celibacy and Vows, to which Martyr replied with his De Coelibatu ... Defensio. To this he appended Smith's retractation, and two letters of Smith to Cranmer from Scotland, written in February, 1550. A similar indication of his nature is given by two letters in MS 119 in Corpus Christi Library, Cambridge - one (No. 41) is a letter of apology to Cranmer for his book de coelibatu patrum, and another (No. 43) to Archbishop Parker, petitioning to have one of his bondsmen released from his bond. A marginal note adds that notwithstanding his fair promises he fled to Paris! His end was worthy of the man - expelled from Oxford for adultery, then a tavern keeper in Wales "where, they say, he has taken a wife, with the view, I suppose, of refuting all your arguments" as Jewel wrote to Martyr (June 1, 1560 - Zurich Letters, p. 81).

I take this statement from Schlosser, p 427.

Doctor Smith had challenged me to a disputation, as the whole University knows; I had agreed to that; we had come to an agreement about the points which should be discussed; but he is said to have absented himself from the appointed day and from this place; telling his friends at the same time that it would mean a pleasure to many people if I kept my appointment with him; so I offer publicly, for the edification of godly minds, to dispute the same points which we desired to treat, with him or any other who will appear in his place, and I take it upon me with God's help, to defend and to prove my propositions. The royal Commissioners and Visitors have appointed the twenty-eighth day of May as the day of Disputation, and given their full permission to discourse.

This challenge was accepted by three of the Romanist party, Tresham and Chedsey, both D.D., and Morgan, M.A. (1) Tresham, a Canon of Christchurch, was the chief opponent, and gave the preliminary address for their side, stating, "I lay upon myself a mighty burden. For I have taken upon me to encounter and dispute with one who is learned, sharp of wit, and exercised in all manner of learning, both human and divine". Yet he seeks to uphold the truth, hitherto received by the Church, and "diametrically opposed" to Martyr's doctrine.

Peter Martyr began his positive proof by showing that Scripture says bread remains in the Eucharist - and by citing the Fathers' Christological analogy: "a comparison to be made between the person of Christ and this sacrament: both of which, since they comprehend two natures, must preserve them both whole, which you in transubstantiating do not do". This analogy, and the Patristic support which Martyr brings for it, guided the whole discussion through to a decided victory for Martyr's doctrine. The whole Disputation reveals Martyr's thorough knowledge of the Fathers, and his uncanny memory in quoting their words at length, or rehearsing the circumstances of their life and works.

At one point, Tresham's books not having arrived, Morgan began. His petty

-
1. None of the three presents an attractive picture: Morgan was known in Oxford as a "Sophist" (Schlosser, p 429); Chedsey in 1547 followed Smith's example and recanted; Tresham, after the publication of Martyr's account of the Disputation, wrote his own version, introduced by an Epistle calling Martyr Pseudomartyr, "a doting old man, subverted, impudent, and famous master of errors" who fled from Germany for the sake of lust and adultery! Strype's Crammer, App XLV gives the full text.

grammatical and philological arguments fared so badly before Martyr's superiority in knowledge and debate, that Schmidt comments, "It was a good thing for Morgan that Tresham had meanwhile received his books and could enter the discussion".⁽¹⁾ Tresham and Chedsey, however, were worthy opponents, each debating with Martyr for two days - Tresham on May 28 and 30; Chedsey on May 29 and June 1. Morgan assisted Tresham briefly on May 30, and Dr. Cartwright gave Martyr a brief respite on May 29. Royal Commissioners were present, and Chancellor Cox presided, summing up the debate at the end. Paying tribute to Martyr, he states: "But Peter, who is worthily called Peter, for his assured steadfastness; Martyr, and worthily called Martyr, for the innumerable testimonies which he gives many times for the truth, ought to have great things at this time, both of ourselves and of all the godly: first, because he has taken the greatest care in sustaining the burden of disputation. For if 'not Hercules himself against two', what say we of Peter alone against all comers? Further, whereas he undertook to dispute, he disproved the vain sayings of vain men, who spread envious and odious things against him; namely, that he would not or dared not defend his doctrine. Finally, that he so singularly well answered the expectation of the great magistrates, and indeed of the King himself, while he not only has delivered unto the University the doctrine of Christ, out of the living fountains of the Word of God, but, so far as lies in him, has not suffered any man to disturb or stop the fountains".

Although it is true that no final decision was reached so far as the Church was concerned, yet the Disputation had two far-reaching results. First, it clarified the issues of the sacramental controversy, removing the false antithesis of Romanist/Zwinglian, which Bullinger's Swiss party had probably not helped to overcome. Thus it prepared the way for the more positive teaching of Bucer

1. II, p 97.

(who had just arrived at the time of Disputation, and indeed thought that Martyr had not moved far enough from the Swiss position) and of Martyr himself. For Martyr was the first Reformed Professor to hold a key position in an English University, and his doctrine in such an important and formal debate would have repercussions in all aspects of Church and State life in those critical days.

Second, Peter Martyr's doctrine, as defended in the Disputation and set forth the same year in print along with the Treatise, and as endorsed by Cox and Crammer, was now the semi-official doctrine of the Church, and therefore was the pre-supposition for the drawing up of the Second Edwardian Prayer Book of 1552 and the Forty-Two Articles of 1553.⁽¹⁾ This introduces us to the subject of Martyr's larger part in the English Reformation, and to that we now turn.

Progress of the English Reformation.

At the close of 1549 the problem of land enclosures, along with other contributory factors, led to insurrection in various parts of England. The priests used this as a pretext for inciting the people against the reformers, urging the laity to demand the re-establishment of the Mass by force. The rebellion reached Oxford, where the violent mob singled out Peter Martyr as leader of the reformed

1. The problem of Martyr's (and Bucer's) positive contribution to the theology of the framers of these documents is a complex one, and lies outside the scope of this work. Some contribution to it is however attempted below. Here we may note that Crammer's 'A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament' appeared in 1550, and shows striking agreement with Martyr's teaching; that Cox and Crammer continued as the closest friends of Martyr, as shown by their lifelong correspondence with him; that Crammer, at the beginning of Mary's reign issued a proclamation that he and Martyr would defend the Prayer Book against any who cared to challenge its teaching; and that Edward VI took a personal interest in Martyr and greatly respected his doctrine. In the British Museum is a copy of the 1549 edition of the Disputation and Treatise, with marginal notes on fol. 8-13 in the handwriting of the King, giving summaries of the argument.
- cf Schmidt, II, p 128: "die reformirten Grunddogmen in der Fassung darin aufgenommen wurden, in der sie Martyr in seinen Vorlesungen vorgetragen hatte; auch die Abendmahlslehre wurde so festgestellt, wie sie von ihm zu Oxford vertheidigt worden war".

party, and cries of "Death to Peter Martyr" echoed through the streets. He was forced to suspend his lectures, and ultimately to retire to London for safety.⁽¹⁾ King Edward was greatly concerned over this turn of events, and received Martyr at Richmond. He promised him the first vacant canonry of Christ Church, Oxford - a promise fulfilled on January 20, 1551.

On his return to Oxford, Martyr resumed his busy life despite continuing opposition.⁽²⁾ This so hindered his peace when he removed to Christ Church - his windows were continually broken, his studies and sleep interrupted, though "all avowed that Martyr was the only scholarly theologian in England"⁽³⁾ - that he exchanged his lodging for the cloister belonging to the second canonry, and erected a stone study in the garden, where he obtained peace to write his commentaries on I Corinthians. He had removed to "the N. side of Christ Church great gate leading to Fish Street", and his wife Catherine being "the first woman, as it was observed, that resided in any college or hall in Oxon."⁽⁴⁾

1. There are extant two writings of Peter Martyr upon this rebellion, in MS 102 (Cat. by James) in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. No. 29 is "A Sermon concernynge the tyme of rebellion translated from the Latin of Peter Martyr"; and No. 31 is the Cogitationes Petri Martyris contra seditionem. In the sermon he says "Now the greates rebellion(s)...at this present tyme are to be bewailed with tears rather than with sword." We must follow the example of Job; we must take the Word of God for our comfort and instructor; we must confess that tumult and sedition spring from sin; we must acknowledge, in the face of "man's law and God's law", our responsibility "in this life and in the life to come"; and above all, let this be our pattern: "Christ did reconcoyle us unto His Father, humbling hymselfe to his father's will, even to the death of the crosse, and he hath commanded all them that profess to be His disciples to follow His example. But alas, how farre be all from His rule and example..." Bucer also wrote a discourse on the Devon Revolt; and Crammer's sermon on the same affair is based upon notes of Peter Martyr. Strype's Crammer, pp 187F, App. XII; C. Hopf, 'Martin Bucer and the English Reformation' (Oxford, 1946) p 84, and Young, p 432, n 2. Martyr's original is in the same library, MS 340.4, Sermo Petri Martyri manu propria scriptus in seditionem Devonensium.
2. cf. his letter to Bucer of Sept. 20, 1550 (Strype's Crammer, App. LX) concerning the disputations, the leadership of Chedsey, and the daily opposition.
3. "der einzige gelehrte Theologe in England" - Schlosser, p. 432.
4. Anthony a Wood, quoted by Young, p 434. cf p 579 for the formal date about this appointment, from Gilpin's Book, MS in the Chapter-House of Christ-Church.

About this time (1550) John White, Warden of Westminster (afterwards Bishop, in Mary's reign) attempted to publish his tract against Martyr, in verse, entitled Diacosio-Martyrion. Strype calls it "In truth a very trifling piece, levelled against Peter Martyr"⁽¹⁾ and indeed its bigotry so distorts the facts of this period as to render its worth negligible.⁽²⁾ White sent it to Louvain for publication, but he and his associates in the work were imprisoned when the work was discovered and returned to London. It was finally published in November, 1553, in London, and its same dedication retained: Ad Serenissimam Illustrissimamque Principem MARIAM Regis EDWARDI VI Sororem."

During this time his work continued to mount. In a letter to Bullinger he describes his activities.

I will explain to you in few words the kind of employment in which I have been engaged. In addition to my daily expositions of St. Paul, which of themselves would almost entirely occupy the time of any one who should employ himself upon them as they deserve, a new burden has been imposed upon this university by laws lately enacted by the king's majesty. For it is decreed that public disputations upon theological subjects should be held frequently, that is, every alternate week, at which I am required to be present and to preside. Then, in the king's college, wherein I reside, theological disputations are held every week, which, inasmuch as all persons are freely admitted to hear them, may in like manner be called public; and over these I am appointed moderator, as over the others. I have therefore a continual struggle with my adversaries, who are indeed most obstinate; so that I am easily compelled, whether I will or not, often to lay aside other matters, and devote the whole time allowed me to the vocation to which I am bound.⁽³⁾

Young calls this "the most useful period of Martyr's life"⁽⁴⁾, and Schmidt says that a greater work than that of dealing with Smith and White was his contribution to the Liturgy.⁽⁵⁾ Indeed, his influence was growing - he received the degree D.D.

1. II. p 439.

2. Its introductory epistle to Martyr not only derides his sacramental doctrine, but accuses him of wilfully causing Smith to leave the country, in order to avoid disputing with him when challenged!

3. Letter of June 1, 1550 - Original Letters (Parker Society, 1847) II. p 481.

4. p 435

5. II. p 120.

from the University of Oxford, and numbered among his friends Latimer, Ridley, Ponet, Hooper and Coverdale, besides Cranmer and the King. (1)

The Vestment Controversy.

In the year 1550 Hooper took his famous stand against the episcopal oath and the vestments which he termed Aaronic and Antichristian. The chief answer to this question was being given by the Swiss party, Burcher, John a Lasco and others, who denied the validity of such vestments in an absolute manner. But Hooper also asked the advice of Martyr and Bucer, in October of that year. Martyr replied in detail in a letter to Hooper of November 4. (2)

1. An interesting aside is given by Strype, II, p 337: "Parkhurst, a fellow of Merton, and an earnest professor of the gospel (afterwards Bishop of Norwich), was one of Martyr's great friends and acquaintance, and whom Parkhurst loved as his father. He, being removed from the university to the rich rectory of Cleve, in Gloucestershire, often invited him to come to his house to refresh himself: but Martyr could never find time to do it. There was a certain liquor made of rough pears, called perry, used much in the counties of Gloucester and Worcester, which the reverend man loved to drink when he was hot and feverish: this his friend Parkhurst used to supply him with".
2. L.C. 1085-1088. The details of this controversy are outside the scope of this work, but Peter Martyr's influence in the whole affair is decisive, along with that of Martin Bucer. Bucer's part is excellently described in Chapter 4 of Hopf's work, in which he also gives, published for the first time, Peter Martyr's letter to Bucer of October 25, 1550 (pp 162-164). A further source, which I have not seen published, is a work, written by Peter Martyr and preserved in the University Library, Cambridge (Tracts Mm 4.14, fol. 12-14). His thesis in this brief tract is: Rerum indifferentium natura est per se vel usurpari vel omitti sine impietate possint. Apparatus vestium sacerdotalium res est ex natura sua indifferens seu ἀδιάφορος. Ergo Apparatus vestium sacerdotalium per se ex natura sua impius non est neque exitiosus usurpartibus. Such things as are agreeable to the Mosaic-Aaronic priesthood possunt in ecclesias nostras revocari seu retineri. Martyr's letter to Hooper of Nov. 4, 1550, also figured in the Elizabethan stage of the controversy, e.g. in the 1566 Pamphlet, 'Whether it be mortall sinne to transgresse ciuill lawes...' which gives the judgment of Melancthon (in his Epitome of moral philosophy) and the correspondence of Bullinger, Gualter, Bucer and Martyr "concernyng the apparel of Ministers, and other indifferent thinges" (London, 1566).

Martyr tells Hooper that he has examined his letter (keeping it but "one night" since he had to forward it by the same messenger to Bucer at Cambridge) and his first reaction is one of elation at Hooper's zeal for the purity and simplicity of religion.

For what should be desired by godly men more than that all things may gradually be removed which have little or nothing that can be referred to sound edification? (quod ad solidam aedificationem referri possit), and which are judged by godly minds rather to redound and to be superfluous?

The custom enjoyed at Strassburg, where all such garments were abolished, is still, to Martyr's mind, the pure imitation of the Apostolic Church.

You therefore see that in the chief and principal point I do not disagree from you, but earnestly desire that what you attempt may have place. This desire of mine is kindled, partly that in ceremonies we might come as near as possible to holy scripture, and pursue the imitation of the better times of the Church; and partly that I perceive the Papal followers attempt by these relics to restore a show of the mass at least (speciem saltem missae); and cling to these things more than the nature of things indifferent requires.

Yet even these circumstances do not cause Martyr to agree with Hooper that this is a matter of something in itself destructive (exitiosus). This is still a matter of "things indifferent" (adiaphora) and therefore still free for our use or rejection. The proper method is surely to first establish true religion in England, then the people themselves will desire to rid themselves of such superfluous affairs. But do not let this become a hindrance to your preaching through contention!

Martyr now answers Hooper's two objections, concerning the Aaronic priesthood, and the antichristian nature of these vestments owing to their Romanist origin. To the first he answers that although the Sacraments of the O.T. priesthood are abrogated, this does not apply absolutely. Yet such things as are indifferent - not necessary to salvation - may not be restored as if they were necessary. Accordingly, with regard to the use of vestments,

this indeed I wish had been laid aside: but when it came about contrary

to my mind, I thought it right to suffer the same until better times should be granted.

What may be used in the Church which comes from Romanism? Martyr warns that we must not subject the Church to a false bondage, denying a right use to everything from that quarter. For:

admit that these things were invented by the Pope, yet I cannot be persuaded that the wickedness of the papacy is such that whatever it touches it completely defiles and pollutes, by which it cannot be allowed to a holy use by good and pious men.

Moreover, Hooper's charge against human invention cannot be applied absolutely.

But the great plea of the letter is this:

How can we deprive the Church of this liberty, that it may not signify something by its actions and rites, this being done without placing any worship of God in them, modestly and in few things, so that the people of Christ be not burdened with ceremonies, and better things not hindered?

And so he concludes:

This in general is enough to know by faith, that things indifferent cannot defile those who live with a pure and sincere mind and conscience ... Nor am I lately persuaded in my mind of this opinion which I have now declared, but judged even from the first that I applied my mind to the Gospel, that these diversities of garments should not be used: but yet thought that their use, if other things prescribed to us by the Word of God remain sound, are neither wicked nor pernicious in themselves or by their own nature.

To this view of Martyr and Bucer, Hooper ultimately bowed, acknowledging "the liberty of the sons of God in all external things ... only the abuse, which can be pernicious to all, of those who use them superstitiously or otherwise evilly do I blame, together with Dr. Bucer, Dr. Martyr, and all godly and learned men ...".⁽¹⁾ We may conclude that in this controversy the influence of Martyr on English Church thought and life is again revealed to be profound and most significant for an understanding of the true nature of the English Reformation.

1. Letter of Feb. 15, 1551, to Crammer, from the Fleet prison - quoted by Hopf, op.cit. p 132.

The Prayer Book and the Ecclesiastical Laws.

The Reformation under Edward VI had been furthered by the Injunctions, Homilies and Visitation, ⁽¹⁾ and then by the first Book of Prayer, of 1549. Cranmer had charge of this work, the conservatism of which allowed even an interpretation of transubstantiation in the office of the Lord's Supper. ⁽²⁾ The advanced Reformers, especially Martyr and Ochino who arrived in England in 1547, and Bucer, whose dealings with England began long before his arrival in 1549, ⁽³⁾ taught a decisively reformed doctrine. During the period of revision of the Book, therefore, Cranmer asked for the opinion of the foreign divines then resident in England. The problem of their influence on the revision of the Prayer-Book is a complex one, on which strongly divergent opinions are held; here we shall simply set forth Peter Martyr's own correspondence on this matter,

Strype ⁽⁴⁾ describes the events of that period as follows. Towards the end of 1550, Cranmer and certain Bishops were reviewing the Book of Common Prayer to remove divers things "that favoured too much of Superstition". Cranmer asked Bucer and Martyr to submit their views upon the matter; Martyr knew the Book

-
1. of Strype, Ecc. Mem. II, Chapter 7. "The king by this time had made a good step in the reformation of religion. For besides the injunctions and the royal visitation, and an English Communion Book, and the communion to be received in both kinds, the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue, the Homilies, and the excellent Paraphrases of that great scholar Erasmus, were all now, by the king's command, brought in for the common use of his subjects" (p 104).
 2. Francis Dryander wrote to Bullinger in 1549, "some puerilities have been still suffered to remain, lest the people should be offended by too great an innovation."; and a short time later, "You will also find something to blame in the Lord's Supper; for the book speaks very obscurely ... it was a long and earnest dispute among (the bishops) whether transubstantiation should be established or rejected". (Original Letters, Parker Society, I, pp 350f, of March 25 and June 5).
 3. at Ratisbon in particular, where he met Gardiner. He was in England only from April, 1549 until his death on March 1, 1551. of especially Hopf, op. cit. Chapter 1.
 4. Mem. of Cran., pp 210f, 251f.

through John Cheke's Latin translation. "Accordingly Bucer wrote his Censure, and Martyr his Annotations ... A Copy of which Censure Bucer had communicated to Martyr". Bucer's Censure had given the general opinion that nothing was enjoined in the Book not agreeable to the Word of God, and then had noted certain definite instances where he thought revision was required.⁽¹⁾ Martyr had sent his Annotations to Cranmer before he saw Bucer's Censure. The latter indicated other matter requiring correction, which he had missed because Cheke's Latin version "was so brief and defective". Therefore Martyr wrote certain Articles and sent them to Cranmer as well. Neither Annotations nor Articles, however, are extant, our only source for his observations being his letter to Bucer of January 10, 1551.⁽²⁾ This we shall quote at length as contributing to the understanding of this most important subject.

(Censura libri Communium Precum)

S.D. - Nothing more welcome or more pleasing could befall me at this time, than to see your censure of the holy book. Wherefore I give undying thanks that you deigned to send it to me. I myself have been asked already to comment whatever seems good to me on this matter. And since, owing to my not knowing the language, the version of Dr. Cheke had been given me to read, so that I could draw conclusions from that, I have noted the things that seem worthy of correction. But because a good many things are lacking in the version submitted to me, therefore I have omitted much, concerning which I said nothing in my Annotations. But then, when I had discovered from your writing that these things were in such manner contained in the book, I was grieved; since I had already, two or three days before, submitted my Censure to the Most Reverend man that had pressed me for it. But now I have offered this remedy: what I have learned from your writing to have been omitted in mine, I have put together in summary; and since

-
1. cf Hopf, op.cit., pp 65-61 for details of these.
 2. The original in MS is in the Corpus Christi Library, Cambridge (MS 119, No. 39, and a copy made for Strype in 1692 is in the University Library, Cambridge, Baumgartner Papers (Strype Correspondence) Add. 3(c); Strype (Mem. of Cran. App. LXI) gives the full Latin Text; according to Hopf (op.cit. p 62, n 1) there is a translation in G.C. Gorham, 'Gleanings of a few scattered ears during the period of the Reformation in England' (London, 1857). n. LXIII. Schmidt's source (II. p 124) is 'Reg. Ashami epistolae, S. 147'. Peter Martyr's letter had survived in Archbishop Parker's papers, and the title Censura libri communium precum is in the latter's handwriting.

the very same things that you have criticized seem also to me unworthy of being continued, these I have reduced into brief articles; and I have informed the Most Reverend, who already knows what you have written to the Bishop of Ely, that in all these heads which I will offer him, noted in articles, I agree with you, that they might be changed.

However, in the first Annotations, almost everything which offended you had been noted by me. Indeed I was sending an example to you now, but do not have it so transcribed that you could read it. Yet I wondered why in the matter of the Communion of the sick, you omitted that which is stated, if it happens on the same Lord's Day as the Lord's Supper is held, then the Minister should take with him part of the elements, and should thus administer Communion in the house of the sick. In this affair it offended me, that what pertains chiefly to the Lord's Supper is not repeated there; and this when - as I think you also feel - the words of the Supper pertain rather to men than either to bread or to wine. I have advised, as seemed good to me, that all things which are required as necessary to the Lord's Supper should be said and done before the sick, and those who communicate with him as well. And indeed it is a wonder that those words are a burden to say in presence of the sick, to whom they are of the greatest utility, when they would repeat the same uselessly when the wine in the cup happens to run short during communion in the Church, since the men who are present and take the sacraments, have already heard them. These are what I thought of some moment, and why you omitted them I do not well understand. But in all things that you have recommended to be reformed, I have written of your opinion. And I thank God who has afforded occasion that the Bishops might be advised by us about all these things. It has now been decided in this Colloquy of theirs, as the Most Reverend informs me, that many things shall be changed. But what in fact they are which they have determined to have reformed, he himself neither explained to me, nor did I presume to ask him. But what Dr. Cheke has told me gratified me not a little; he says, that if they themselves will not effect the changes which are to be made, the King himself will do it; and when he has come to Parliament, he will interpose his Royal authority.

.....

Yours in Christ,

Peter Martyr.

From the foregoing we see the common ground of criticism occupied by Bucer and Martyr; and the significant place their censure was given by Cramer and the King himself. In the Nineteenth Century controversy concerning baptismal regeneration, much material was amassed by both sides about the doctrine; but Martyr's influence is accepted as being a most important factor in the revision of the

Prayer Book. Thus Massingberd⁽¹⁾ is willing to admit, "the address in our Communion office, to be used when the people are negligent in coming to the Holy Communion, and which was added with the second, or 'emended' edition of the Prayer Book, to which this letter⁽²⁾ refers, is attributed to his pen. Another alteration, which certainly originated with him, was the omission of the practice of sending what remained of the elements after the public administration of the Holy Communion, to the sick at their own houses". Peter Martyr's letter, we may note, criticized not the practice but the method of such administration; but the fact that his influence was deemed sufficient - apart even from Bucer's - to account for such alteration is significant.⁽³⁾

The second letter of Martyr's bearing upon this issue was discovered and published by William Goode,⁽⁴⁾ who uses it to show that the Prayer Book does not imply baptismal regeneration - indeed the dispute following its publication shows that it was not considered to have settled this question. The Prayer Book had passed the Houses of Parliament in April, 1552; on June 14, Peter Martyr addressed a letter to Henry Bullinger, which reads in part as follows.

-
1. F.O. Massingberd, 'A Letter to the Rev. Wm. Goode, M.A., showing that the opinions of Cranmer, Ridley and Bucer, concerning Holy Baptism, were opposed to those contained in a letter to Peter Martyr, lately published by him' (London 1850). This curious thesis is based upon the common mistake of judging Martyr "Zwinglian"; he takes "those who hold the other opinion" in Martyr's letter as referring to Bucer, Cranmer, etc.! But see our Appendix. D.
 2. of Martyr to Bullinger, published by Goode.
 3. of Martyr's Treatise An in communione liceat una tantum specie uti, 21 - the sick should get the sacrament: it is Papist superstition that introduces such problems as whether the wine should be that used in the Mass.
 4. 'An Unpublished Letter of Peter Martyr, Reg. Div. Prof. Oxford, to Henry Bullinger; written from Oxford just after the completion of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI; edited, with remarks, by Wm. Goode, London, 1850.' Goode was a supporter of G.C. Gorham in the controversy.

That matter which was desired by all good men, and which the King's Majesty had not a little at heart, could not be accomplished; wherefore as yet things remain to a great extent as they were before, except that the Book or Order of Ecclesiastical Rites and the Administration of the Sacraments is reformed, for all things are removed from it which could nourish superstition. But the chief reason why other things which were purposed were not effected, was that the subject of the Sacraments stood in the way; not truly as regards transubstantiation, or the real presence (so to speak) either in the bread or in the wine, since, thanks be to God, concerning these things there seems to be now no controversy as it regards those who profess the Gospel; but whether grace is conferred by virtue of the sacraments is a doubtful point to many. And there have been some who altogether held the affirmative, and were desirous that this doctrine should be established by public authority. But when others clearly saw how many superstitions such a determination would bring with it, they made a primary point to endeavour in all ways to show, that nothing more is to be granted to the sacraments than to the external word of God, for by both these kinds of word is signified and shown to us the salvation obtained for us through Christ, which as many are made partakers of as believe these words and signs, not indeed by the virtue of the words or of the sacraments, but by the efficacy of faith. Moreover it was added, that it was impossible that the sacraments should be worthily received, unless those who receive them have beforehand that which is signified by them, for unless faith is present, they are always received unworthily, but if they who come to the sacraments are endued with faith, they have already received through faith the grace which is proclaimed to us in the sacraments, and then the reception and use of the sacraments is the seal and obsignation of the promise already apprehended. And as the external words of God avail to the quickening and exciting our faith which is often torpid, and as if lying asleep in us, this same thing also the sacraments can effect by the power of the Holy Spirit, and their use if of no little benefit to confirm our minds, otherwise weak, concerning the promises and the grace of God. But in the case of children, when they are baptized, since on account of their age they cannot have that assent to the divine promises which is faith, in them the sacrament effects this, that pardon of original sin, reconciliation with God, and the grace of the Holy Spirit, bestowed on them through Christ, is sealed in them, and that those belonging already to the Church are also visibly implanted in it. Although of those that are baptized, whether children or adults, it is not to be denied that much advantage and profit comes to them from the invocation of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, which takes place over them. For God always hears the faithful prayers of His Church. We were anxious that these things should be determined and established by authority concerning the sacraments, that their use might at length be restored to a state of purity and simplicity. But it was opposed; and many are of the opinion, and those otherwise not unlearned nor evil, that grace is conferred, as they say, by virtue of the sacraments. Nor will they grant that little children are justified or regenerated before baptism. But when we come to their reasons, there are none which do not most readily admit of solution. Nevertheless no little displeasure is excited against us on this account, namely, that we altogether dissent from Augustine. And if our doctrine was approved by

public authority, then, say they, Augustine would manifestly be condemned. Why need I add more? ... (1)

From this, Goode points out the similarity between Martyr's teaching and the phraseology of Articles 26 and 27; and also suggests that this dissent of which Martyr speaks, was the chief reason for the delay in the publication of the Articles, which "were at last published by Royal authority in the following May". Martyr's influence on the authors of the Forty-Two Articles is thus bound up with the same question. To the same purpose we may cite Strype's estimate of his relationship with Cranmer: "As for the learned Italian, Peter Martyr, who is worthy to be mentioned with Melancthon and Calvin, there was not only an acquaintance between him and our Archbishop, but a great and cordial intimacy and friendship. For of him he made particular use in the steps he took in our Reformation. And whenever he might be spared from his public readings in Oxford, the Archbishop used to send for him, to confer with him about the weightiest matters. This Calvin took notice of, and signified to him by letter, how much he rejoiced that he made use of the counsels of that excellent man. And when the reformation of the ecclesiastical laws was in effect wholly devolved upon Cranmer, he appointed him and Gualter Haddon, and Dr. Rowland Tayler his Chaplain, and no more, to manage that business. Which shows what an opinion he had of Martyr's abilities, and how he served himself of him in matters of the greatest moment. And in that bold and brave challenge he made in the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, to justify, against any man whatsoever, every part of King Edward's reformation; he nominated and made choice of Martyr therein to be one of his assistants in that Disputation, if any would undertake it with him"(2)

-
1. For Peter Martyr's doctrine of Baptism, see Chapter V.
 2. Mem. of Cran. p 413. The reference in Calvin is as follows (Epistolae et Responsa, 1597, Ep. 127, p 252), Quoniam autem non dubito, quin haec tibi subinde veniat ultro in mentem, et ab optimo et integerrimo viro D. Petro Martyre, cuius te consilio uti plurimum gaudeo, suggerantur: tot tamen ac tam arduae difficultates quibuscum lactaris mihi visae sunt sufficere, ne super-vacua foret mea exhortatio.

Along with the fact of Peter Martyr's influence in the revision of the Prayer Book, which is generally agreed to be very great, ⁽¹⁾ must be placed a similar influence upon the framing of the Articles, which formed the basis of the Elizabethan Thirty-Nine Articles; and also a much more direct influence upon the new laws - Cranmer's Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum. Of this last Martyr wrote to Bullinger:

I came to London some time since, on account of the holding of the assembly commonly called a parliament. For the king's majesty has ordained, that, as the gospel is received in his kingdom, and the bishop of Rome is driven out, the church of England shall no longer be ruled by pontifical decrees, and decretals, Sixtine, Clementine, and other popish ordinances of the same kind ... the king has appointed two and thirty persons to frame ecclesiastical laws for this realm, namely, eight bishops, eight divines, eight civil lawyers, and eight common lawyers; the majority of whom are equally distinguished by profound erudition and solid piety; and we also, I mean Hooper, a Lasco, and myself, are enrolled among them. May God therefore grant that such laws may be enacted by us, as by their godliness and holy justice may banish the Tridentine canons from the churches of Christ! ⁽²⁾

As we noted above, the work ultimately fell upon three men, Haddon, Taylor and Martyr. Strype comments, "These commissioners at last finished their great work; and the king lived not long enough to get it enacted; and so it fell, and that great labour frustrated." ⁽³⁾

We may conclude this section by observing that the revision of the prayer-book doubtless reflected the censure of Bucer and Martyr, and the latter particularly in terms of his teaching on the sacraments. Thus in the Communion

-
1. The question is not whether there is such an influence, but whether it is good or evil. e.g. H.M. Luckock ('Studies in the History of the Prayer-Book', London, 1882) treats Martyr's influence under the general section on 'The Puritan Innovations' (Ch. 2), and decries his "Zwinglianism". Thus the problem shifts from the historical to the theological level, and in this work our whole testimony to Martyr's theology must stand as our opinion.
 2. Lambeth, March 8, 1552 - Orig. Lett. II, p 503.
 3. Ecc. Mem. III, p 89. cf G. Burnet, 'History of the Reformation of the Church of England', London, 1681, Part III, p 208: "Some of them were also revised by Peter Martyr: the 7th Chapter in the Title de Prescriptionibus is all written by Peter Martyr".

Service all idea of propitiatory sacrifice was removed: the 'altar' became 'table', 'priest' became equivalent to 'minister'.⁽¹⁾ And in the total view of the reformation in England, the work of Peter Martyr is a decisive and lasting element, both in this personal activity and through his disciples.

Volte-Face.

The high hopes of this activity of reformation were suddenly crushed by the death of the young "Josiah" and the accession of "Bloody Mary". On July 16, 1553, the sixteen-year old King died. At this time Peter Martyr was recovering from an illness, and had recently suffered the loss of his wife. A letter of his faithful Julius (Terentianus) to John Ab Ulmis gives the details of the succeeding events.⁽²⁾

"The papists, who had been always longing for this most wished for day, dig out as it were from their graves their vestments, chalices, and portasses, and begin mass with all speed ... Master Peter Martyr is forbidden to leave his house; and Sidall, a truly excellent man, is ordered to guard against his running away; and thus Master Peter has had his own house made a prison of these six weeks". Meanwhile Julius went to London to assist Martyr by petitioning the Queen for his freedom to quit England, on the grounds that he had been called into England by invitation, as correspondence in the royal archives would show, and had committed no offence against law or crown.⁽³⁾

1. cf Lindsay, op.cit. pp 361ff. An interesting comment is that by Jean Cadier, 'La Doctrine Calviniste de la Sainte Cène' (Études Théologiques et Religieuses, Montpellier, 1951, 1-2), p 110: Peter Martyr's arguments in the Oxford Disputation, along with Bucar's teaching, led in 1552 to the revision of the Prayer-Book, as exemplified by the formula in the office of the Supper so close to that recently adopted by the French Reformed Church: 'Accorde-nous qu'en recevant les choses créées, le pain et le vin, selon la sainte institution de notre Seigneur Jesus-Christ, en souvenir de sa mort et de sa passion, nous soyons rendus participant de ses très saints corps et sang'.
2. Orig. Lett. I, pp 365-374; from Strassburg, Nov. 20, 1553.
3. In 1552 Martyr had been recalled to Strassburg, but Edward and Cranmer refused to let him go - cf Strype's Ecc. Mem. III, p 188.

"We agree therefore among ourselves, that Whittingham should return to Oxford and remain with Master Peter; for he was now almost entirely by himself, since every one, except only Sidall and Master Haddon, had withdrawn from his society". Finally Martyr himself was allowed to come to London to plead his case, which was granted him after audience. Gardiner - it should be noted - strongly supported it.

His residence while in London was at Lambeth with Crammer. A significant happening at this time was the public posting on September 5, of the Archbishop's declaration, to dispel the current rumours that he was to re-establish the mass, and even say it at the King's funeral.⁽¹⁾ It begins by acknowledging "the cunning and deception of Satan," whose Latin Mass, which suffered a beginning of reform under Henry VIII, but complete annulment under Edward VI, the Enemy now roars and rages to return. In this regard, many "from malice or stupidity disparage the erudition of Dr. Peter Martyr". Therefore Crammer declares, "I with Peter Martyr and four or five others of my choosing," will in public and formal debate, "prove to all that not only the common prayers Ecclesiastical, the Holy Administration, with the rest of the rites and ceremonies, but also the whole doctrine and religious order established by our supreme King and Lord, Edward the Sixth, are more pure and more agreeable to the Word of God than what has been in England for the past thousand years".

Terentianus comments: "Master Peter commends this act, and says that had it not been done, he had intended to propose it to him. They prepare themselves for the disputations". But the priests, formerly clamouring for debate, now "began to change their note", choosing to "abide by the received doctrine" and citing Crammer on a new charge of treason, on September 13. "Master Peter then dined with the archbishop, who after dinner came into his chamber, and informed him that

1. Purgatio Reverendissimi in Christo Patris ac Domini D. Thomae Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, adversus infames sed vanos rumores a quibusdam sparsos, de missa restituta Cantuariæ. Burnet, op.cit., II, App. II.8 gives the text; cf pp 248f

he himself must of necessity abide a trial; and that it was certain that he should never see him again". The sad farewell was taken, and Martyr's distress at leaving Cranmer was heightened by the circumstances of danger and secrecy in which he was forced to quit the country. He crossed to Antwerp and on October 30 reached Strassburg, where Jean Sturm, Sleidan the historian, Zanchi, Hubert and others welcomed him home.

Thus ended Martyr's service to the cause of reformation in England - with cries of "Arch-Heretic"⁽¹⁾ and with escape by night. Gardiner became Chancellor, and Tresham Vice-Chancellor, of Oxford University, and Smyth was returned to his former post of Regius Professor of Divinity, to which Martyr had succeeded him for a time. With these appointments, he who had been "the chief instrument of Cranmer's reform"⁽²⁾ now cried, "This tinkling has overthrown all my doctrine" (Hoc tintinnabulum omnem meam doctrinam evertit.).

V : THE SECOND STRASSBURG PERIOD : November, 1553-July, 1556.

Writing to Calvin from Strassburg on November 3, 1553, Peter Martyr indicates the position in which he found himself at Strassburg after six years absence.

By what means, most worthy Sir, God snatched me from the lion's mouth, even I myself have not yet ascertained, much less can I signify unto you. But, like Peter when brought out of prison by the angel, I thought that these things which were done had been seen in a dream; even now I can scarcely think it true that I have escaped. But yet I am safe and well here in Strassburg ... I doubt not we shall have many famous martyrs, if Winchester (Gardiner) who is now in high favour, begins to show his cruelty ... I am uncertain whether I shall remain at Strassburg. Perhaps the controversy about the Eucharist will be a hindrance. However I do not strive much about it ...⁽³⁾

-
1. Erzketzer - Schlosser, op.cit. p 439
 2. Da Martyr ... "das Hauptwerkzeug von Cranmers Reform war" - Ibid. p 414.
 3. L.C. p 1091.

On the same day he wrote another letter to Bullinger, and said in part:

Hence it is that I am now here, but I do not yet know whether I shall again be received in this church and school; for, as I suspect, the sacramentary controversy will occasion some difficulties: however, I am not very anxious about it. (1)

Peter Martyr would like to have been with Calvin at Geneva, or with Bullinger at Zürich, for in their theological climate he felt himself at home. (2) But the Senate of Strassburg was most anxious to have him return to his former position there, as Professor of Theology. He realized, however, that the extreme Lutheran faction now strong and influential in Strassburg, would cause trouble about his sacramental teaching. This happened very soon. On December 15, he wrote to Bullinger again:

My own affairs are in this condition. Our friend Sturmius, and the principal professors, with the greater portion of the clergy, have made strenuous exertions for my remaining here; and they had the governors of the school sufficiently favourable to this arrangement. But two or three of the ministers, who possess some influence, object to it on account of my opinions respecting the sacrament, and have raised such an opposition that the matter cannot yet be concluded. Since therefore I am loth to be with persons unwilling to receive me, I implore you by our friendship and affection in Christ, to look about for some situation or other, in which I may be able to exercise my calling with honour and advantage. (3)

Led by Marbach, the Lutherans objected to the Senate's desire to have Martyr re-appointed, on the grounds "that in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper he had departed from the opinion of the Augsburg Confession, and so it was feared that he might make trouble in the Church" (Simler). They demanded that he sign the

1. Original Letters, II p 505

2. Calvin had by this time influenced Bullinger, and the Consensus Tigurinus of 1549 was the result.

3. Orig. Lett. II, p 509.

concordat between Luther and Bucer, to testify his good faith.⁽¹⁾

Martyr's reply was framed as a formal statement to the governors of the College, in which⁽²⁾ he declared his acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession, when "rightly and profitably understood". He further promised to give his opinions "with all modesty, and without bitter attack". And finally, regarding the concord between Luther and Bucer, he refused to subscribe because he could not grant that those destitute of faith eat the body of Christ in the receiving of the sacrament. Bucer himself, here in Strassburg, and also in England, taught the opposite! And to give his signature to that concord would be to offend the Church in Switzerland, England, and the brethern in Italy and France. He concluded by affirming his love for the Churches of Saxony, and his desire for unity and peace.

This declaration was given on December 27; on January 22, 1554, he wrote to Bullinger:

Your congratulation on my being restored to my former office in this place, which business however was only concluded today, is in accordance with your friendly and benevolent disposition. May the Lord grant that I may some time reap the desired fruit of my labour!⁽³⁾

1. Marbach and his followers demanded that Martyr acknowledge an eating of the body of Christ in the Supper by the wicked, to guarantee which they brought two documents as test cases. One was the Augsburg Confession, which could be interpreted either (with Calvin and Martyr following Melancthon) in its 1540 form as signifying Christ's presence in the Supper, or (with Marbach following Luther) in its 1530 form as signifying His presence in the bread itself. The second is apparently the Concord of Wittenberg of May 29, 1536, a mediating formula of marked inconsistency, but specifically stating in Art. 3 that etiam indignos manducare, ita sentiunt porrigi vere corpus et sanguinem Domini etiam indignis, et indignos sumere ubi servantur verba et institutio Christi. (Kidd, 'Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation', Oxf. 1911, p 318). But Schlosser (p 443) following Simler, identifies the concordat in question with the confessio tetrapolitana of July 11, 1530 (Kidd, p 475). This earlier document, a mediating formula of Bucer, could have been so used at this time; but (1) Luther did not actually sign it (Kidd, pp 468ff), and (2) Martyr himself in a letter to Calvin of this period (Cal. Epist. 197, p 370) indicates the authority of the Wittenberg council over the Strassburg ministers. cf. A. Barclay, 'The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper' (Glasgow, 1927), Chs. 7 and 8 for this period.
2. The document is given in full in Appendix E.
3. Orig. Lett. p 511

The Senate appointed him to his former office in the College of St. Thomas, therefore, where he began lecturing on the Book of Judges. An additional task, and one noteworthy for this study, was that of lecturing on Aristotle on alternate weeks, along with Girolamo Zanchi, one of the monks converted by Martyr at Lucca. The formal study of Aristotle had been begun by Bucer, until Jean Sturm relieved him of the duty in 1536. Martyr now lectured on the Nicomachean Ethics⁽¹⁾, and Zanchi on the De Natura.

Many exiled Englishmen found refuge at Strassburg, the most noteworthy being John Jewel, later Bishop of Salisbury and author of the Apologia of the Church of England. He had been a reader at Oxford when Peter Martyr arrived in 1548, and became one of his closest friends and followers, being expelled at Mary's accession "as a follower of Peter Martyr and a Lutheran". He fled to Frankfort in 1554, and Martyr called him to Strassburg, to his own household. Jewel transcribed Martyr's Commentary on Judges "and read the Fathers with him, especially St. Augustine"⁽²⁾. A group of such exiles gathered at Martyr's home for regular study and prayer. One happy result of this fellowship was Martyr's decision to write the Defensio adversus Gardinerum. Archbishop Cranmer had been preparing such a major work, a detailed refutation of the doctrines of transubstantiation and propitiatory Mass which Gardiner, now Bishop of Winchester, and the chief champion of the Papal cause, had set forth in a work which was noted for its "extraordinary number of passages from the fathers".⁽³⁾ Cranmer's death posed a problem; but Martyr, because of his own thorough knowledge of the Fathers, was probably the proper man for the task.

-
1. The commentaries are published, but only as far as the beginning of Book III. See Appendix A.
 2. 'Illustrations of English Religion', ed. Morley, p 174.
 3. Schlosser, p 456. cf Appendix D. Gardiner issued two works, one under the pseudonym Antonius Constantius, which he later declared his own, in 1554. Cranmer's rebuttal was partly finished before his death, but perished.

The English exiles asked him to accept the challenge, and offered to have it printed at their expense. Martyr accepted, and the work - an eight-hundred page book on the Eucharist - was published in 1559. Of this work Martyr wrote to Calvin: (1)

my Book is under the press, in which I have discovered and confuted all the fallacies and tricks of Stephen Gardiner, one time Bishop of Winchester, concerning the matter of the Eucharist. This I trust, happens at a good time: for it will be specially profitable at this time that the English Papists may understand that his book is not invincible, as they have hitherto boasted.

Letters to Poland and Lucca.

In the year 1556 Peter Martyr wrote two lengthy Epistles, one "To the Lords of Poland, professors of the Gospel, and to the Ministers of the Churches", and the other "To the Brethern of the City of Lucca". (2) All his activities of these last years of his life further indicate his role as ecumenical Reformer, and both letters reveal his strength of character and theological wisdom. We shall briefly sketch the content of these before continuing the story of the events at Strassburg.

The problem in Poland would doubtless be specially familiar to Peter Martyr because of his friendship with the Polish Reformer, John a Lasco. He had also been approached on certain questions by Francis Lysman, and his letter was in part a reply to this. The situation in Poland, which had recently "embraced the Gospel" (3)

1. L.C. 1121, December 1, 1558.
2. Dominis Polonis Evangelium Profitentibus et ecclesiarum ministris, February 14, 1556 (L.C. 1109); Epistola D. Petri Martyris ad Fratres Lucenses, Italice edita anno MDLVI ... (L.C. 1100)
3. In correspondence with Calvin at this time, Martyr informs him of the letter to Poland (Letter of Feb. 16, 1556, L.C. 1114), describing it as showing the scriptural doctrine of the sacrament; in another letter (of April 8, L.C. 1119) he tells Calvin of a report that the Polish affairs had a hopeful ending in the Parliament, and this is clarified in a letter sent the next week (April 16, L.C. 1124) when he states, "The servant of Alasco was recently here, and declared that in Poland the Parliament is dissolved, and the affairs of Religion held over until September".

was one of deep theological strife concerning the doctrine of Christ and therefore also of justification. Osiander was the chief figure in the controversy, with his doctrine of "essential human righteousness", and a Christology approaching the Eutychian confusion of the Two Natures, against which Stancaro, the other protagonist in the debate, advanced a doctrine almost Nestorian in its separation of the natures to a point endangering their unity.⁽¹⁾ Such a problem of theology, common but by no means superficial, was understood in all its implications by Martyr, whose own strife over the Supper was rooted in the Christological doctrine, and had constantly revolved around these two poles.⁽²⁾

Accordingly, in his letter Peter Martyr, after expressing his joy at their faith, immediately opens the question of Christology; warning them against false teachers, who follow human invention and not the "heavenly wisdom" of the word of God.

For they say that they profess the true God ... (but) join to this some opinion of Arius or Servetus or some other fanatic. And they boast that they worship and embrace Christ the true Son of God and our redeemer: but straightway they either confound the two natures or else deny him to be joined to a human creature; they boldly and ignorantly say that His body is diffused everywhere, and is multiplied and closed within every piece of Eucharistic bread, and included in them; or they madly imagine that the substance of his flesh was not taken of the matter of the blessed Virgin Mary but rather brought out of heaven or else conceived and formed of the substance of the Holy Spirit ... I do not therefore write these things unto you, my dear brethren, as though I suspect you to be infected with these evils, but so that I may very plainly show that the immortal God our Father, and Christ the Son of God and most true God and man, must be apprehended and received with that faith which shall be drawn from the very fountains of holy scripture, and not from the puddle of human dreams.

Another section on the true meaning of the sacraments warns us of the twofold error of making too much or too little of the sacrament.⁽³⁾ The elements are

-
1. of Schmidt's account of this whole controversy, II, Book 4, Ch. 6: "Martyrs Wirksamkeit für die Reformation in Polen" - Osiander und Stancaro."
 2. Martyr himself is usually called a Nestorian by the Romanist, whom he accuses of the Eutychian heresy in regard to the sacrament.
 3. The details of this section will be discussed thoroughly in Part III.

instruments of the Holy Spirit, sacramentally therefore the body and blood of Christ, which the faithful receive by the mouth of faith, as they are raised up to Christ Himself by the action of the Holy Spirit.

I am most assured that the Church of Christ shall never have a quiet and peaceable consent of doctrine, or a sure peace between brethren, and a sincere purity from superstition, unless the sacrament of the Eucharist be delivered after this or like manner ... in the rite of administering the sacraments, that manner is most to be embraced which shall be most plain, and most remote from the Papistical trifles and ceremonies, and which shall come nearest to the purity which Christ used with His apostles. Christian minds ought not to be occupied much in outward rites and ceremonies, but to be fed with the Word, to be instructed by the Sacraments, to be kindled unto prayers, to be confirmed in good works and excellent examples of life.

A further necessity in the reforming of the Church is discipline, which is to be cleansed from its Romanist errors and superstition, but not to be removed. There is a "rule of the Gospel regarding brotherly correction", and this is to be diligently observed, guarding against "the tyranny of one or of a few" by the "consent of the Church" as the normal method of discipline. Another great instrument of reform is the establishing of schools of divinity, where pastors are taught - their chief study being the "reading and re-reading of the Books of the Holy Bible", avoiding vain and contentious questions.

The second part of the letter gives Martyr's answers to Lysman's four questions. The first concerns the problem of whether Christ suffered in His divine nature. Martyr "utterly denies" this, but points out that the unity of the Persons bestows a communication of names and so it may be said "this Christ who is God and man suffered, was crucified and died". But "How should the nature of God suffer and die without change of itself?" The second question also springs from the Christological debate - is Christ Mediator through one or both natures? Martyr answers, through both: "a true mediator must have in him the two parts of those in controversy". The third question of Lysman reflects Osiander's problem, of confusing the natures so that the manhood is denied, or divinised. But Martyr

declares that Christ is Son of God by nature, from the Godhead, and son of man by nature, from the manhood he assumed. "Nor is this to divide Christ" - the charge against him brought by the Eutycheans - "since we embrace him most truly to be one".

Doubtless if we would shun absurdities, we must take special heed that we mingle not and confound the two natures of Christ, which if we shall not commit, it will not be hard for us to understand the origin of his properties.

Finally, the question about Osiander's "essential justice" (iustitia essentialis) needs little answer - it is plainly contrary to scripture, which knows only justification by faith, and "there is no need to light a candle in the sunshine of so clear a truth".

Martyr closes the letter with an interesting comment on the affair of Servetus, which was bothering the minds of the Polish Christians:

And regarding Servetus the Spaniard, I have nothing else to say but that he was the devil's own son, whose evil and detestable doctrine must be banished everywhere. Nor is the Magistrate that put him to death to be accused, since there could be found in him no signs of amendment, and his blasphemies were altogether intolerable.

The second letter we are considering, to his brethren and former flock at Lucca, is much different in nature. The little Church had come upon evil days, and the heavy hand of persecution had fallen. Many who had criticized Martyr's flight now had found recantation a way of escape. His letter is not bitter, however, but full of grief at their circumstances, and preaching the comfort of Christ.

I had at the beginning laid among you some foundations of Christian truth, according to the will of the heavenly Father: weakly at that time as I confess before God, yet so that - not by my power but by the favour of Jesus Christ - the endeavour brought no small profit as well to me as to you ... But now when it has seemed good unto God to prove his household by tribulation and to try the constancy of your faith, Alas! what lamentable proofs, what unhappy events are heard of there! For the valiant courage of a Christian heart, a wavering imbecility, a faint faith, a trembling heart and most shameful denial of the truth ...

how shall I keep from weeping?

.

You knew the fury of antichrist, and the danger which threatened you when you refused to fly and profit by what some call the resource of the weak, but which I consider a wise precaution in certain circumstances ... Alas! how cruelly have these bright hopes been crushed ... Do not think, my dearest brethren, that we here are careful only of our own salvation; no wound can be given you, but the stroke pierces us too.. For Christ did so join together all members of His body, which is His Church, that they should communicate in feelings with each other.

The ground of their comfort, he continues, must be sought in Christ Himself, and their unity with Him:

But if it behooved Christ to suffer, that he might enter into His glory, no doubt but we also must suffer if we will be there with Him.

He includes a form of prayer for them that are fallen, based on the confession of the prodigal son (Luke 15.18) and stressing the mercy of the Father in Jesus Christ; and he speaks of the true repentance as against the false and hypocritical.

After this indication of the contents of these letters, we shall return to the events of the last two years leading up to Martyr's removal to Zürich.

The "Supper-Strife".

About a year after coming to Strassburg, Martyr was asked by the Elders of the Italian Church in Geneva to become their minister. Calvin strongly supported this call, which Martyr himself found most pleasing, as he tells Calvin in reply:

it would delight me very much if at last I could for once do service to my own countrymen from Italy. For I am not made of brass, nor is my flesh of iron. (1)

But he feels obligated to remain at Strassburg, especially since there are men like Martinengo available. The Church later called Martinengo as minister.

1. Letter of March 8, 1555 - L.C. 1094-6.



In the same letter to Calvin, Peter Martyr refers to Marbach, who in the Lord's Supper maintains "such a presence as wicked and unworthy eaters feed upon, showing clearly that he attributes not the receiving unto faith". This was the growing issue of consubstantiation, which threatened the unity of the Strassburg Churches, and the position of Martyr in particular. In his Oration given at Zürich when he removed there in 1556, he gives a summary of this strife. (1)

To the Senate, professors and friends of old I am sure my return was most welcome, but not to all the ministers. I speak of those who are daily prepared to declare impudently - but not to prove - that cakes and pieces of bread are the very body of Christ.

The controversy became so hot that the Senate asked Martyr to hold the peace, with which he complied willingly, although "the Saxons and our men wrote sharply against each other". These ministers preached publicly against Martyr and his friends, whom they termed Sacramentarii, but refused debate. Finally they bribed a youth (subornatus est puer) to read a paper denouncing them:

a very bitter invective against the Sacramentarians. With great grief and sorrow godly men heard it. For what else was this than to sound a trumpet?

At this point correspondence reached Martyr from Zürich, inviting him to succeed the late Conrad Pellican as Professor of Hebrew. In his reply to Bullinger on May 7, 1556, he informs him that he has told the Senate of his desire to depart: (2)

Not that I am unmindful or ungrateful for benefits received, for I know my deep obligation to this noble commonwealth; nor would I suffer myself to be separated from it if I could agree with their ministers about the sacrament. But since there is no hope of this, I have openly expressed how desirous I am to go whither I am called by most loving brethren: I seized this opportunity to complain to the magistrate of our doctrine of the Eucharist being in a public assembly both immeasurably and shamefully spoken against by the ministers of the city, and I added that I both wonder and regret that they will not treat this subject openly in the schools, though in the

-
1. L.C. 1066
 2. Young, p 454.

churches they utter both outrageous and bitter speeches against it. Briefly, I have now twice pleaded my cause before them, and also with some who were appointed to talk with me apart; and I thought that in four days they would have been able to despatch the matter. But this day the Senate answered that there was some reasonable cause for my desire to depart, but that I must not act hastily in so important an affair, and therefore they requested that I would wait patiently for at least a month for a decided answer. They promise that at the end of that time they will either offer me such conditions as I can conscientiously accept and remain among them, or they will leave me at liberty to follow my wish of going to you. This request of our magistrates, to whom I am much beholden, and who share your opinions, I could not honestly refuse, especially as they added that there are certain reasons why they could not suddenly give me a decided answer, and so against my will I yielded that period of delay which they required. But I pray you be of good cheer; as much as lieth in me I will not fail to strive that your calling me shall not be in vain. A month will soon slip away.

After the month of delay the Senate offered him the conditions, that he should avoid certain points of doctrine and restrain his zeal on others. But Martyr insisted on "liberty of teaching, disputing and writing" (Simler). This meant severance of his ties with Strassburg - the city where he had first settled as an exiled Reformer, and where the memory of friends such as Bucer and Jacob Sturm still lingered. He had always intended to serve this city further, and while in England thought of it as his home. Thus at Bucer's death he wrote to Conrad Hubert of Strassburg:

O wretched me! as long as Bucer was in England, or while we lived together in Germany, I never felt myself to be in exile. But now I plainly seem to myself to be alone and desolate ... Oh how continually had he on his lips the church of Strassburg! what anxieties he underwent for her! ... What discourses, what conversations took place respecting all of you, our worthy brethren in Christ! When we were talking together, we seemed to be conversing in the midst of you all at Strassburg: we were thinking of our return, but he has outstripped me, and betaken himself not to our Argentine⁽¹⁾ church, but to the golden one of heaven.⁽²⁾

Of these two men, then, one died in England, his life shortened by its climate, and the "return" of the other proved to be saddened and cut short by strife and

-
1. "silver"; the Latin name for Strassburg.
 2. Orig. Lett. II, p 491

enmity. On July 13, 1556, Peter Martyr, accompanied by John Jewel, left Strassburg for Zürich.

As his final testimony to the whole debate about the Eucharist, Martyr presented to the Senate before his departure a lengthy Confessio seu Sententia.⁽¹⁾

It began:

Our Saviour Jesus Christ consists of two natures joined in one and the same person or hypostasis, not are these confused or mingled together, but the properties and conditions of both safe and whole. (Servator noster Iesus Christus duabus naturis constat in una eademque persona seu hypostasi coniunctis, nec his quidem vel confusis aut permixtis, sed proprietatibus et conditionibus utriusque salvis et integris.)

From this he concludes the true humanity of Christ, so that "we have Him not present in the body". Yet the Eucharist is a true and valid apprehension of His body and blood, the same once delivered to the Cross for our salvation. This is a spiritual communication and participation, and therefore the wicked receive only signs, for faith is the instrument for receiving Christ. Christ's words "This is my body" are spoken altogether figuratively (omnino tropice) - but the figure here is sacramental, that is, the sign and its signification are joined

not by a common signification such as is used on a stage or theatre, but an effectual one, since the Holy Spirit uses that instrument to stir up faith in us, by which we may apprehend the promised participation of the Lord's body.

The power of faith means the presence of Christ.

Therefore what hindrance are spaces of places (locorum spatia), which stand between heaven, where Christ abides, and ourselves, that we may not enjoy His body and blood and be quickened by them? Surely nothing at all, if faith is present, by which our souls, assisted by the Word of God and the sacraments, may be carried up into heaven (subvehantur in coelum) and there be refreshed with the spiritual food and drink of the body and blood of Christ, and be restored to life eternal.

For the man Christ Jesus is the Mediator, unto whom we are joined as closely as to be "of His flesh and His bones". This union is "spiritual, secret, and divine",

1. L.C. p 1068.

and therefore requires "no substantial and corporeal presence of His body and blood". Martyr concludes:

Wherefore to this union that we have with the Lord, that is, with His body, blood and bones, there is no need of a physical contact, nor of conjunction of places, continuous or contiguous - but the Spirit and faith are operative, by which we are most closely coupled to the whole Christ our spouse and Saviour. (Spiritus et fides adhibenda sunt, quibus toti Christi sponso et Servatori nostro quam arctissime copulamur).

With this confession of his faith Martyr not only reminded the Lutheran party that he himself taught a true union with Christ and a real presence of Christ in the sacrament, but also framed in few and striking words the essential elements of his complex and mature doctrine of the sacrament.

VI : ZÜRICH : July, 1556-November, 1562.

Henry Bullinger received Martyr into his house, and here he found, among men like Bullinger, Bibliander and Gualter, the theological climate he had long sought. He lectured on the Psalms, the Minor Prophets, and the Books of Samuel and Kings. At this time also he was again married, to a member of the Italian Church at Geneva, Caterina Merenda. This union proved most happy, and was blessed with several children, although none survived. (1)

Once again a call was extended to Martyr from the Italian Church at Geneva, this time on the occasion of Martinengo's death in 1557. Calvin wrote to the Council of Zürich urging the release of "our venerable brother Peter Martyr". (2) The need for such an one as Martyr among his own people was pressing at this time, because of the dangerous growth of heterodox opinion in regard to the doctrine of the Trinity. This is a complex problem, involving men such as Stancaro, whom we

1. of the plaintive sentence in a letter of March 20, 1560 to Sampson, "A son was born to me the 2nd of March and died the 10th day of March".
2. Young, p 582 gives the complete letter.

noted above in regard to the Polish Church, Lelius Socinus, whose works were later used by his nephew as the basis of Socinianism, and Bernardino Ochino. Ochino had become pastor of the Locarnese congregation in Zürich on June 13, 1555. His friendship with Stancaro, in whose company he had quitted Italy, had doubtless familiarized him with such teaching - or "speculation"⁽¹⁾ - and now in his Zürich congregation he found Socinus, a member often under suspicion, but whose personal charm and speech could bring Calvin himself to acknowledge his innocence.⁽²⁾ Ochino therefore came under strong suspicion of heresy, but Peter Martyr's mediation prevented the Zürich clergy from taking action. After Martyr's death, however, Ochino - then seventy-six years of age - was involved in a serious charge of teaching polygamy and antitrinitarianism, and finally banished from the city.

It was against such a background that Calvin urged Martyr's acceptance of the Genevan call. However, the Senate and ministers of Zürich refused to give him leave, and there the matter ended. This was perhaps for the better, since Martyr's personal influence was probably more needful to the Italians in Zurich than in Geneva. But Martyr played his part in the Genevan problem too. In a letter to Calvin of July 11, 1558, he states:⁽³⁾

I heard of some trouble in the Italian church, which grieved me so much that my mind could scarce be quiet day or night. After the report

1. cf McCrie, op.cit., pp 177-187, 420-436 for an excellent account of this problem, especially as it concerned Zürich during these years. On p 180 he says, "The genius of the Italians led them to indulge in subtle and curious speculations, and this disposition was fostered by the study of the eclectic and sceptical philosophy, to which many of them had of late years been addicted" and cites Melancthon's frequent mention of their "platonie and sceptical theories", and Calvin's remark about the same - In Italis, propter rarum, magis
eminet.

acumen

2. McCrie, p 426.

3. L.C., pp 1120f; Young, pp 470f, following Marten's E.T. has June.

reached us, Georgius the physician⁽¹⁾ came here. He immediately began to talk to me, and I perceived that he thought I would lean to his opinion. But he was much deceived, for no man can detest this error more than I do. I conferred two or three times with this man, and saw things were as you write; namely, that these men believe but one person in the Divine nature, that of the Father only, and affirm that the Father and the Son do not form one essence ... I referred the matter to Bullinger; he disliked it much, and desired me to break off the controversy as soon as possible, which indeed I was of myself minded to do, for opinions like these are not easily rooted out. Therefore having said to this man whatever I thought profitable, I begged him to reconcile himself with your church, otherwise he could have no place among us. Behold, at a seasonable moment I received letters, which to my great joy informed me that the Italian church had come to an agreement, and that a form of doctrine had been drawn up to which they had all subscribed ...⁽²⁾

His greatest influence during these years, however, was not felt by his own countrymen, but by Englishmen. Elizabeth ushered in a new era in 1558, and the exiles hurried home, including Martyr's beloved John Jewel. But in their struggles for reform, their revered teacher and friend in Zürich was constantly relied upon for advice and encouragement.

The Affairs of England.

Writing to Bullinger in May, 1559, Jewel states:⁽³⁾ "Our universities are so depressed and ruined, that at Oxford there are scarcely two individuals who think with us", while Soto and Garsya "have so torn up by the roots all that Peter Martyr had so prosperously planted, that they have reduced the vineyard of the Lord into a wilderness. You would scarcely believe so much desolation could have been

-
1. George Blandrata, a noted antitrinitarian - cf McCrie, pp 183, 414. cf Young p 582 for extract from the Genevan archives concerning the Confession of Faith drawn up at Calvin's advice in May, 1558 to settle this controversy, of which Alciati and Blandrata were chief instigators.
 2. Young, pp 469f, thinks that this situation is the cause of the rumour which Jewel reports in a letter to Martyr of Nov. 6, 1560 (Zur.Lett. p 91): "unfavourable to yourself, painful to us all" and confirmed even by Grindal and the Archbishop of Canterbury; but the arrival of brethren from Geneva who related "that all is with you as we desire", settled the question. This would more likely be the heretical tendencies of Ochino and Socinus, which Martyr succeeded in overcoming in 1558 (cf McCrie, pp 430f; Young, p 392), but which continued in varying degree until the sad events after Martyr's death.
 3. Zur.Lett. p 33.

effected in so short a time". But the tone of subsequent letters is increasingly hopeful, as new Bishops are appointed from the group which followed Martyr, and reforming activity resumed with vigour. At this time it was rumoured that Martyr himself was returning. Jewel wrote on November 2, "I heard from the Archbishop of Canterbury that you are invited hither, and that your old lectureship is kept open for you"; and three days later, reports that "nothing is at this time more talked about, than that Peter Martyr is invited, and daily expected to arrive in England".⁽¹⁾ This latter report was in connection with the Queen's attitude to Martyr, a subject worthy of note at this point.

Elizabeth's early years had involved a significant period under the tuition of Hooper, and the Bishop of Aquila described her as "saturated ever since she was born in a bitter hatred to our faith", owing to the teaching of the "Italian heretic friars" Martyr and Ochino.⁽²⁾ Thus it is not surprising to find Jewel writing to Martyr as early as March, 1559, "The queen regards you most highly; she made so much of your letter, that she read it over with the greatest eagerness a second and third time"; and the following month, "The queen both speaks and thinks most honourably of you: she lately told lord Russel that she was desirous of inviting you to England, a measure which is urged both by myself and others, as far as they are able".⁽³⁾ The letter referred to is one written by Peter Martyr to the Queen, on December 22, 1558.⁽⁴⁾ In this letter Martyr addresses Elizabeth as one who has not only received a kingdom, but a task and a

1. Ibid., pp 45, 54.

2. Quoted by Lindsay, op.cit., p 368.

3. Zur.Lett., pp 11 and 20 (of March 20 and April 28).

4. Serenissimae Elizabethae, Dei Gratia Reginae Angliae, Franciae et Hyberniae, a Deo Patre, per Iesum Christum Servatorem nostrum, Gratiam et aeternam foelicitatem. L.C. 1121-1124

trust to restore the true Church and to maintain genuine religion. The priests seek not the true restoration, but carry the ark of the Gospel "on the carts of unprofitable ceremonies, and foul labours of hired servants" - a reference to II Samuel 6,7. Therefore he exhorts her -

If Bishops and Ministers of Churches will not do their duty, if in handling doctrine and administering of sacraments they forsake the just rules of Holy Scripture - who but a godly Prince shall recall them into the right way?

Along with this influence over the Queen, Martyr enjoyed a popularity as a leading theological writer. Jewel writes, "Your book on Vows, like all your other works, is caught up with great avidity. We are all now looking for you to publish your further commentaries on the book of Judges, and on the two books of Samuel; for all our friends are now aware that you have those books in hand, and are intending to publish them."⁽¹⁾ This was especially true of his Defensio adversus Gardinerum already mentioned, which appeared at this time, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. Jewel writes of its expected arrival in England: "When your present arrives, it will, I doubt not, be most acceptable to the queen; and since you wish it, although it is in itself most excellent, yet, should I have an opportunity, I will set forth its value in my own words ... Your other books have long since been brought over by the booksellers, and are purchased with the greatest eagerness; for everyone is most anxious to see by what hunting spears the beast has been pierced"; and he later tells Martyr of Elizabeth's reception of the Book: "the queen of her own accord eagerly perused both your letter and the book itself, and wonderfully commended both your learning and character in general ...

-
1. Jur. Lett. p 46 (of Nov. 2, 1559). cf p 112, Cox to Martyr (Aug. 5, 1562): "I have lately been employed in your book on Judges, which you most kindly sent to me; and I am waiting for the commentaries which you promised on the books of Kings, that I may often hold intercourse with my friend Peter, as long as I am able to range at large among his writings".

your book was made so much of by all good men, that I know not whether any thing of the kind was ever so valued before... The queen however made diligent enquiries of the messenger, as to what you were doing, where you lived, in what state of health and what circumstances you were, and whether your age would allow you to undertake a journey. She was altogether desirous that you should by all means be invited to England, that as you formerly tilled, as it were, the university by your lectures, so you might again water it by the same, now it is in so disordered and wretched a condition. But since then, the deliberations about Saxony and the embassy from Smalcald have put an end to those counsels". (1)

The question of inviting Martyr to England was postponed while the proposal to join the Smalcald League was considered. This, the Queen was advised, "can by no means be brought about, if Martyr should return to us". (2) But finally in 1561, the formal invitation was extended by "a most famous nobleman in England", to whom Martyr replied: (3)

But now as touching my return to England, although I am unable to answer as I could earnestly desire, do you, most noble prince, with your usual kindness take in good part what I write in reply. First of all, I would not have you think that I have anything more at heart, than the solid and firm well-being of England in the Lord. But at this present time, such is the situation in which I am placed, that I am engaged to the state and church of Zürich, and am therefore not my own master. I have therefore enquired the opinion and inclination as well of the magistrates as of my fellow ministers upon this matter; and indeed I found in them a singular zeal and most ready mind to satisfy your desire ... But on the other hand they no less prudently than lovingly take into consideration my constitution, state, and age; and are somewhat apprehensive lest, burdened as I am and in some

-
1. Zur.Lett. pp 21f and 53f (of April 28 and Nov. 5, 1559).
 2. Ibid., p 21, Jewel to Martyr (of April 28) the advice was given by Peter Paul Vergerio, Bishop of Capo d'Istria.
 3. Illustrissimo Principi (---) in Angliam, July 22, 1561; L.C. 1134f. This is thought to be the Duke of Norfolk (cf Zur.Lett. 20n2, Young p 471 etc.); but in the E.T. of the L.C. (by Marten, London 1583), a letter is included along with the translation of this one, addressed explicitly "To the Right honourable the Earl of Bedford", dat. 1561 (p 164B of final section). The contents of the two are very similar, and both mention the desire of the Queen which the Duke and the Earl must have cited.

measure broken with age, I should be unable to bear the fatigue of the journey, which is rather long, variable and not without difficulty. They see moreover that no small danger is to be apprehended in different places on the road; and they consider too, that I am called forth to much more severe labours than I undergo in this place. Wherefore they think it very likely that I shall be unable to serve either them or you; and are therefore of opinion that it is much better for me to remain here, where, by teaching, writing, and publishing my commentaries, I may be of use both to them and you and others, according to my ability.

Martyr's influence on the Elizabethan reformation, however, is unmistakable. The issuing of the Prayer-Book and the Thirty-Nine Articles in particular reflects the work of those Bishops who looked to Geneva and Zürich for the source of their theology, and to Peter Martyr their former friend and teacher at Oxford, for inspiration and advice in their struggles and problems.⁽¹⁾ Perhaps the best illustration of this influence is Martyr's correspondence with Thomas Sampson. This again reflects the more positive teaching of our Reformer, like that of Bucer and Calvin, as against the "Swiss Party" opinions which had dominated the minds of Hooper and now Sampson, until Martyr in both cases introduced the deeper and

-
1. of Lindsay, *op.cit.*, pp 385ff, regarding this influence. For example, the repudiation of the doctrine of ubiquity in Art. XXVIII in the first draft (struck out by Convocation), and the striking anti-Lutheran doctrine of Art. XXIX ('Of the wicked which do not eate the Body of Christe in the use of the Lordes Supper') - temporarily suppressed - surely point to the English theologians' sympathy with Peter Martyr, whose debate on ubiquity (cf our Chapter 8) was then at its height. The correspondence of the time reveals this clearly especially Jewel's to Martyr and then to Bullinger. Thus shortly after Martyr's death (March 5, 1563) he writes to Bullinger, "I do not wonder that your Hercules of Tübingen (Brentius), the forger of monstrosities, is now triumphing at his ease; I wonder whether he is able to confine himself within the ample limits and regions of his Ubiquitarian kingdom. Should he make any attack upon our departed friend (Martyr) and his writings come to my knowledge, unless some of you should be before hand with me, I shall think it my duty to reply"; and finally on March 1, 1565, "Among other things, the Ubiquitarian question is pressed upon me, which, for the sake of our old Tübingen friend, I have purposely treated of very copiously, to the best of my power, and as the subject required; but in our own language, as being intended for our own people". (*Zur. Lett.* pp 123, 139). Burnet, *op.cit.*, II., App. I.55, gives the text of the Articles of 1552 and changes of 1562.

decisive element into the whole debate.⁽¹⁾

Thomas Sampson was a constant correspondent with Bullinger and Martyr⁽²⁾; and having once already sought Martyr's advice on certain definite and detailed questions pertaining to the English reformation,⁽³⁾ he approached him in a letter of January 6, 1560,⁽⁴⁾ with a more serious and urgent problem, "whether the image of the crucifix, placed on the table of the Lord with lighted candles, is to be regarded as a thing indifferent"? If not, and if they are enjoined by the Queen upon her ministers, must not one retire from the ministry? "Certain of our friends, indeed, appear in some measure inclined to regard these things as matters of indifference: for my own part, I am altogether of opinion, that should this be enjoined, we ought rather to suffer deprivation". Sampson submits the question to the opinion of Martyr, Bullinger and Ochino, and suggests that any of them, perhaps Ochino in preference, since his authority "has very great weight with the queen", might write a letter to Elizabeth on this subject.

The controversy was not a personal matter with Sampson, as Hooper's had been. Jewel wrote to Martyr the following month⁽⁵⁾ and stated: "this controversy about the crucifix is now at its height. You would scarcely believe to what a degree of insanity some persons, who once had some shew of common sense, have been carried upon so foolish a subject. There is not one of them, however, with whom you are acquainted, excepting Cox. A disputation upon this subject will take

-
1. The term "Zwinglianism" is a historical misnomer; but there was a "Swiss Party" centering in Zürich, whose doctrine was extreme and negative, especially in regard to ceremony and sacrament; Calvin's influence, and doubtless Martyr's too, wrought a more positive emphasis among them, beginning with the Consensus Tigurinus of 1549. In Appendix D certain aspects of the problem are examined.
 2. cf Orig. Lett. I, pp 172-183.
 3. Zur. Lett. p 1 (of Dec. 17, 1558) - questions about the title "after Christ supreme head of the Church of England"; and about the episcopal office - but no reference to the use of vestments, crucifix, etc.
 4. Ibid., p 62.
 5. Feb. 4, 1560 - Zur. Lett. p 67.

place to-morrow. The moderators will be persons selected by the council. The disputants on the one side are the archbishop of Canterbury and Cox; and on the other, Grindal the bishop of London and myself". By April, Bishop Sandys could write to Martyr: (1) "God, in whose hand are the hearts of kings, gave us tranquillity instead of a tempest, and delivered the church of England from stumblingblocks of this kind: only the popish vestments remain in our church, I mean the copes; which, however, we hope will not last very long". But meanwhile, Martyr had given his friends definite and detailed advice about the matter. This is contained in four letters he wrote to Sampson. (2)

Martyr's first letter, of July 15, 1559, addresses a man who is "afraid on both sides" - of withdrawing from the ministry and of accepting a bishopric. Martyr agrees that these are not things indifferent, but "intolerable blemishes" marring the Apostolic simplicity of the Church. He suggests two things, that Sampson should continue to preach and teach sound doctrine, and that he should "for a while abstain from the ministering of the Sacraments" until the blemishes are removed. The second letter (November 4) replies to letters of August 27, In this Martyr admits that he is slower than Bullinger to condemn such apparel, since he thinks it better to allow them than to be deprived of preaching. But since the matter has become one of positive offense, he declares "I willingly yield unto his opinion". His reason is, that what was a thing indifferent (vestments) has become identified with positive evils -

Indeed where altars and images are preserved, I myself of my own accord, affirm just as I have written in other letters, that you must not minister ... When I was at Oxford I would never use those white vestments in the Choir, although I was a canon.

-
1. Ibid., p 72.
 2. These letters are in L.O. 1125-1128 - July 15 and Nov. 4, 1559; Feb. 1 and March 10, 1560. They are addressed simply amico cuidam in Anglia; but there is no doubt that they are replies to Sampson, as (1) my use of their contents will show; and (2) the reference to Jane (Letter 1; Sampson's of Jan. 6, 1560) also indicates. For Sampson's letters of Orig. Lett. I, pp 181, 182, Zur. Lett. pp 1, 62, 75. cf Schmidt, II, p 226.

The third letter (February 1, 1560) expands and clarifies this position. Martyr distinguishes the matter of vestments from that of the crucifix. The former is basically an indifferent thing, and the need of ministers overrules, in this instance, its evil use: "I exhort you not to withdraw yourself from the function offered, since there is so great a lack of ministers there". Wear the vestments but preach against their use! But the question of the crucifix is of a different order:

But I would never counsel you that when you preach or minister the Lord's Supper you should have the image of the crucifix upon the table.

Finally, the letter of March 20, in reply to Sampson's of January 6, when the controversy was reaching its height, reflects the true issue:

to have the sign of the crucifix upon the holy table while the Lord's Supper is administered, I do not account among things indifferent (*inter ἀδιάφορα*), nor would I advise any man to distribute the sacraments according to that rite ... In brief, the worshipping of images must by no means be suffered. Neither Dr. Bullinger nor myself account such things indifferent; but rather we refuse them as things forbidden.

This was the opinion that won the day; and Martyr's influence is evident, both directly in the correspondence cited, and indirectly by the fact that the Bishops in question were in a sense his disciples, led by Jewel who always closed his letters to Martyr with "Farewell, my father". Such was the service rendered to England in his closing years by our Reformer.

The Poissy Conference of 1561.

I am called into France to act in a colloquy concerning religion. A safe-conduct is brought here in the name of the king and queen-mother, both signed and sealed. And by letters of the king of Navarre am I earnestly invited, so that it hardly seems that my journey can be deferred. Since the affair is important and full of danger, I heartily desire your lordship that you will commend the same, and myself also, most earnestly in your prayers to God. (1)

1. Letter to Bishop Parkhurst, Aug. 23, 1561 - L.C. 1136.

Catherine de' Medici, queen-mother of France, was largely instrumental in arranging the Colloquy. Her reasons were partly political, since she sought Protestant support against the Guise faction, but partly also deriving from her erstwhile attraction to the Protestant party of the King and Queen of Navarre, Conde, Coligny and others. ⁽¹⁾ The Cardinal of Lorraine expected the conference to crush the Reformed group; but Beza and Martyr were summoned to represent it. ⁽²⁾ An invitation from Antoine, King of Navarre, addressed to the Senate of Zurich, and enclosing a safe-conduct for his security, brought Peter Martyr to Poissy. ⁽³⁾

On his arrival, Martyr visited Antoine, the Prince of Conde, and Admiral Coligny and later was summoned to the presence of Catherine. In this interview, and another before he left Poissy, Martyr spoke at length to the Queen in their common native tongue. ⁽⁴⁾ He stressed the duty of Princes to reform religion within their realms, and reminded her that God was with those Princes who sought His glory. To her questions about the strife which religion had brought, he replied that pure religion could not be maintained without the Cross; about her asking his consent to the Augsburg Confession, he tells Bullinger:

-
1. Young, p 474, says that she was attracted by the psalmody of Marot, choosing Psalm 150 as her own, according to the Court custom then in vogue.
 2. The comparison and contrast of Beza and Martyr forms the motif of Schlosser's thesis (op.cit.); it should not be carried as far as he does, but is useful in understanding the events of Poissy. Beza was the leader, the man of affairs and of action: "Beza wollte nützen und glänzen, Martyr nur erbauen ... Beza's Eifer und Martyrs Billigken und Mässigung". (pp 6,8).
 3. of Young, p 583 for copy of the Letter. In Corpus Christi Library, Cambridge, MS 119.6 is "A safe-conduct granted by Charles IX king of France to all persons coming to the assembly at Poissy, dated at St. Germain's July 25, 1561".
 4. I use Martyr's correspondence with Bullinger, Letters of Sept. 12, 19, Oct. 2, 17 and 20 (L.C. 1136-1143); with Calvin (Oct. 4 - L.C. 1141), Lavater (Oct. 19 L.C. 1142), and Beza (Nov. 6, from Trois - L.C. 1143), as the sources for this section. of Beza's own account (Hist. des Eglises Reformées) and Conde's Memoires.

When she mentioned the Confession made at Augusta, I answered that the holy scriptures ought to be sufficient for us, and that she should not persuade herself, that if the Augsburg Confession were received, it would be done with the consent of the Churchmen.

Beza's famous speech which opened the Colloquy on September 9, is described by Martyr as follows:

The matter was committed to Beza, to make the opening or preface to the conference; he spoke in French the space of one hour, as they say. But towards the end when he happened to mention the Eucharist, he said that they ought to know this, that the body and blood of the Lord is as far from the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper as heaven is from earth. These words so offended and aroused the Bishops, that they began to murmur and at last to make a din, so that Beza had much trouble in ending his speech.

The Cardinal of Tournon called for an immediate end to the conference; but the Cardinal of Lorraine desired to make his reply, and this was arranged for September

15. It had been disputed whether to allow Martyr to be present -

However, the Queen at the hour of departure summoned me and commanded me to go. The Prince of Conde gave orders for me to be brought by his secretary, and sent his own mule by which I might be brought easily and quietly.

Martyr reports on Lorraine's speech:

When he had spoken much of these things he came to the matter of the Sacrament, where he meddled not with transubstantiation or the Mass, but mentioned no other presence of the body of Christ than did Luther and Brentius. For he affirmed that the body of Christ is present not locally nor circumscriptively, but after a heavenly manner, and super-substantially ... Some of the Bishops of better judgment would have us agree to the consubstantiation of Luther and Brentius. We deny this to be possible: and in this we constantly persist, that the body of Christ is in heaven and not elsewhere. But we grant that in the holy Supper the faithful communicants receive the true body and blood of the Lord, yet by faith and the Spirit, and that the distance of places hinders not the conjunction itself, since it is a thing altogether spiritual.

The debate took a new turn after Beza had replied to this speech, for Lorraine demanded that the Reformers should sign the Augsburg Confession as

indicating a doctrine of real presence.⁽¹⁾ On this issue Martyr was finally allowed to speak. On September 26 he addressed the conference in Italian. Replying to Lorraine, he first "defended the ministry of our Church", correcting in passing the Cardinal's historical ignorance of the Councils of the Early Church.⁽²⁾ But his main contribution was on the issue of the Eucharist. The Cardinal had demanded that the words 'This is my body' be taken simpliciter; as for Martyr:

I objected moreover that he was greatly deceived, in daring to affirm that in God's commandments in the sacred histories, in the Testaments and Sacraments, there are no tropes or figurative speech: and from the scriptures I demonstrated that tropes are to be found: whence it cannot be concluded by him, that the words of the Lord which they call Consecration, are to be taken simpliciter.

The Cardinal declined to reply, feigning ignorance of Italian, but a Spanish Jesuit (Laincz), deputed by the Cardinal of Ferrara, Papal legate, gave "a most violent oration" which precipitated a tumult. The Queen was obliged to intervene, reducing the disputants to five on each side.

There followed a quieter debate, and Martyr wrote hopefully, "so far as I can see, we have adversaries meek enough and who disagree not much from us". But Ferrara was especially keen to see an end to the proceedings; five of the Romanist delegates "were not only suspected by the Cardinals and Bishops, but accounted

-
1. Letter of Oct. 2 to Bullinger is the most important in the series. Schlosser p 469, notes that Bullinger meanwhile wrote to Martyr advising against accepting the Augsburg Confession under any circumstances (e.g. persecution of the French Church) whereas Martyr did not like Bullinger to think more of that Confession than of the persecution.
 2. The question of the Reformed ministry was the second chief question debated, along with that of the Eucharist, although four questions had been propounded, the authority of the Church, the power of Councils, the Authority of Scripture, and the real and substantial presence in the Supper (Lett. of Sept. 12). In this regard it is interesting to note that Beza was much confused by the problem of the laying on of hands, since he believed it to be necessary to valid ordination. Martyr had warned him to avoid this question, and himself strongly denied its necessity (cf Schlosser, pp 469ff).

as Heretics, because they seemed to consent with us about the sacrament". The Conference was suspended fifteen days, and finally dissolved on October 19. No conclusions were reached; but the Gospel was being preached throughout France, and the French Confession was being urged in place of the Augsburg. An edict of January 17, 1562, gave legal recognition to the French Reformed Church, prohibiting meetings for public worship and surrender of Church buildings, but allowing meetings outside walled towns and anywhere in private houses. The Massacre of Vassy and subsequent events brought grief and disillusionment to Martyr and his friends. (1)

The last stages of the Conference, however, had produced a document drawn up by the Reformers on October 9, although rejected by the Romanists. But this, along with Martyr's personal statement presented to the Colloquy, is a further document significant not only for Peter Martyr's own theology, but also for that of the Reformation in general. Accordingly, both documents are reproduced in Appendix E. The Poissy Colloquy was the last great service which our Reformer was privileged to render in behalf of the Reformation, and once again his ecumenical activity is evidenced in a profound manner.

The return trip involved an incident which Schlosser terms the one blot on Peter Martyr's career. (2) It ought rather to serve as a reminder that the Reformers' ecclesiology was ordered by their doctrine and was not so systematic as their various followers would like to think! Bishop Caracciolo of Troie, a Neapolitan who had sat under Martyr at S. Pietro in Naples, at Poissy had been forcibly

1. of Martyr's letters to Beza and Calvin, Nov. 25, 1561 - L.C. 1143f.
2. op.cit. pp 459, 477ff. Schlosser charges Martyr with preferring "friendship to the duty of accepting only blameless clergy to the Church". He perhaps thinks Martyr was influenced by Caracciolo's status - son of the prince of Melfi. But if McCrie is correct in identifying him with the Neapolitan (op.cit. p 148), Martyr would have known the Bishop's long sympathy for the Reformed cause, as well as his personal character and life. There is confusion about the details of this incident, but it is best to treat it briefly, as does Schmidt, II 272f.

struck with the debatable nature of his office, which ignored the people's voice. He took Martyr back with him to Trois, and there put his problem before him. Martyr advised him to call a meeting of the clergy of Trois. This resulted in an acceptance of Caracciolo as Bishop over the Protestant Churches, with one dissenting vote. His case remained unique, and problematic to Rome. He was deprived of his bishopric, but had already taken congregation and income with him! Ultimately the Queen settled a pension upon him, the only Bishop which the French Reformed Church knows. (1)

Strife and Rest.

Martyr returned to Zürich full of years and weariness. But he returned to a position still active in the struggles of the period. He had been involved in the Strassburg debate concerning predestination, with Bibliander and now Zanchi. (2) He was still reckoned a major figure in the realm of teaching, and was again asked to accept a chair at the University of Heidelberg. (3) But the most significant work of these closing years, apart from his service to England and completion of the work against Gardiner, was the strife with Brentius.

-
1. As Schlosser remarks, loc.cit. Martyr's account of the affair is found in his letter to Beza from Trois, Nov. 6, 1561 - L.C. 1143. For Calvin's attitude to Bishops, which is in full agreement with this action of Martyr, see Choisy, 'Calvin et l'Union des Églises', Bulletin de la Soc. de l'Hist. du Prot. Français, 1935, 87; Pannier, 'Calvin et l'Épiscopat', Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse de l'Univ. de Strasbourg, 1926.
 2. Martyr's teaching is given in a Treatise embodied in his Comm. in Rom., at the end of Chapter 9 - De Praedestione. He and Zanchi had taught the doctrine together at Strassburg, but after Martyr had gone to Zürich, Zanchi through controversy with the Lutherans developed a doctrine of perfectionism, by which predestination meant a security that could not be lost. (cf Schmidt, II, pp 274ff - he is the only one that treats Martyr's struggle about this doctrine. pp 107ff, 172, 215ff, 274ff). This position Martyr sought to correct by a friendly commentary on the theses Zanchi drew up (Schmidt gives them in summary, pp 279-281).
 3. Schmidt records two calls to Heidelberg, both refused by Martyr. The first was as he was preparing to leave Strassburg for Zürich (1556). II. pp 184, 242.

The "Supper-strife" at Strassburg, headed by Marbach and centering around the Farrago published in 1555, which had openly advanced the doctrine of ubiquity in support of consubstantiation in the Eucharist, ⁽¹⁾ now passed into a new phase under the leadership of Brentius (Johann Brenz) ⁽²⁾ Since Brentius had been an able fellow-worker with the Reformers, ⁽³⁾ Martyr sought to refute his doctrine in a friendly and reasonable spirit, and his Dialogue of 1561 was such a book. Of it Martyr wrote to Parkhurst: ⁽⁴⁾

I send you the Dialogue which I wrote against the ubiquity of Brentius. For a few months ago he set forth a little book in which he tried to defend with all his power this monstrous opinion. Whereupon I was here required by the brethren that I should answer him: which I have done as well as I could. But you, most reverend Prelate, along with other learned men, shall judge how thoroughly I have performed it.

But Brentius in reply launched a violent attack, De divina maiestate Christi et de vera praesentia corporis et sanguinis eius in coena, 1562. This troubled Martyr greatly in his last days. During his final illness, Bullinger had repeated the text, 'We have a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens', to

-
1. Farrago confusaneorum et inter se dissidentium opinionum de coena domini ex Sacramentariis libris congesta, Magdeb. 1552; Recta fides de coena Domini, Ebedn, 1553; Farrago sententiarum ... Frank. 1555. Calvin's Secunda Defensio of January, 1556 replied to this; Martyr's Confessio ... de coena domini, 1556 (to the Strassburg Senate) forms his reply.
 2. In 1560 Brentius published De personali unione duarum naturarum in Christo et ascensu Christi in coelum, accessione eius ad patrem; Schmidt remarks (II. p 237): "Brenz veröffentlichte seine, durchaus scholastische Schrift über die persönliche Einheit der beiden Naturen in Christo und dessen Erhöhung in den Himmel".
 3. cf Kidd, op.cit., pp 164, 254. Brentius played a leading part in the Swabian Syngramma of 1525, and had enjoyed the friendship of Calvin.
 4. Aug. 23, 1561 - L.C. 1136.

which the dying man said, "I know, but not the heaven of Brentius which is nowhere".⁽¹⁾ Yet another incident shows his true feeling. Bullinger had remarked "Our true fatherland is in heaven", and Martyr replied, "But not the fatherland of Brentius. But no - he sits there as much. I forgive him; I am angry with him no more. Had God spared me life, I had refuted him; but only for the weak-willed"⁽²⁾

About this time a happier reaction was called forth by the publication of Jewel's Apology. In his last letter to Jewel, Martyr expresses his pride and satisfaction in the work, and then continues:⁽³⁾

But as touching myself, if you desire to know more particularly how I do, understand that I am of a cheerful mind in Christ, and that I am occupied in the same labours in which I was engaged when you were here; but in body I am not so strong and lusty as I was heretofore. For the burden of old age daily becomes more heavy ... Wherein though the body properly and by itself be afflicted, yet by reason of that connection which the Greeks call sympathy, the mind also cannot choose but be affected.

Two months later, about November 5, Peter Martyr became suddenly ill of a fever then prevalent. Trying to shake this off and resume his lectures, he suffered a relapse, and his friends soon realized that death was near. The study of medicine having long been a favourite pursuit of his, he conversed at length with the physicians that attended him. Towards the end, before taking leave of the friends gathered at his bedside, he declared, "I believe that life and salvation have been given by God the Father to the human race through Christ alone; He is the only Saviour". Supporting this confession with Scriptural passages, he concluded, "This is my faith, in this will I die".

1. of Gualther's verse in Carmina Doctorum aliquot virorum in obitum D. Petri Martyris Vermilii conscripta (intro. to L.C.): ... Nunc igitur coelum inveni sedesque beatas. Moxque suam inveniet Brentius Utopiam.
2. Quoted by Schlosser, p 479.
3. Aug. 24, 1562 - L.C. 1147; Zur. Lett. p 339.

On November 12, 1562, his strength was very low; he took fond leave of Ochino, and the pastors and elders of the Italian Church. At last he commended his soul unto God, and "Bullinger, though greatly overcome, summoned courage to pay the last offices of humanity. With his own hands he closed his eyes, and dressed him in his funeral garb".⁽¹⁾

.

So died a Reformer of ecumenical stature, well worthy of the high honour in which he was held by his contemporaries - well worthy also of respect and imitation by those who have reaped the fruit of his labours in Italy, Germany, England, Switzerland and France. The times were great; great things, the ultimate things, were at stake: and God raised up men great in mind and in life to fulfil His purposes and to re-form His Church. Peter Martyr Vermigli was such a man.

.

Against such a background of life and action, we shall turn to an examination of Peter Martyr's theology. Together they may serve to bring us near to one of the greatest of the Reformers. Thus Bishop Jewel wrote to Josiah Simler after receiving the latter's biography of Martyr, along with a silver medal bearing his effigy:⁽²⁾ "In the figure indeed, although there is in many respects an admirable resemblance (to the original), yet there was a something, I know not what, in which I was unable to perceive the skill of the artist. And what wonder is it, that there should be some defect in producing the likeness of one, the like of whom, whenever I look around me, I can scarce believe ever to have existed? Your little book, however, I perused with the greatest eagerness and delight. For I

1. Young, p 490.

2. March 23, 1563 - Zur. Lett. p 126.

seemed to myself to behold the same old man with whom I had formerly lived upon such affectionate terms; and to behold him too, I know not why, more nearly and thoroughly, than when we were living together".

PART I.

REVELATION AND SACRAMENT.

CHAPTER I : BY WORD AND SPIRIT.

Truly this Body is not destitute of its weapons: but they are spiritual, not carnal, namely the Word and the Spirit, through Whom it overcomes human wisdom, casts it to the ground, and leads captive our mind and thought to the obedience of Christ. (Catechismus 39) (1)

Peter Martyr's teaching on the sacraments is not only the fullest expression of his theology, but in a deep sense its key doctrine. This is because he accepts the Person of Christ as the archetype of all theological thinking, and this material principle is most clearly operative in his distinctive contribution to the Sixteenth Century sacramental controversies. The context of that contribution was the intensive Biblical studies, a part of which is preserved for us in the few Commentaries published. In these we see the source of his theology, revelation by Word and Spirit, (2) and the dynamic solution which this Biblical revelation gave him for the sacramental problem posed by scholasticism.

The Word of Life.

This is the stronghold of our faith, that by the Word of God all things consist. (in Gen. 1,5)

No man was created by God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, but through the Word of God; and therefore we must not look for man, now fallen and overthrown, to be restored by any other means than the same Word. (Encomium Verbi Dei)

The act of creation is the Trinitarian God in action, as the Fathers taught:

1. Appendix A gives the complete works of Peter Martyr. Since there is no standard text for any of his works, I give the sections used in the Loci Communes wherever possible, although this work is reliable only for the Treatises given in full, and not for its excerpts from the Commentaries.
2. The Loci Communes Petri Martyri (Massonius, first ed. 1579, Zürich) is therefore wrong to begin with the scholastic problem of natural knowledge of God as if this ever interested Peter Martyr outside of its context in Scripture!

Father, Word and Spirit; ⁽¹⁾ man is created by the Word of God in order to image His "holiness, righteousness and truth". ⁽²⁾ But now, "the intercourse and most sweet familiarity which man had with God at the beginning is broken off by sin". ⁽³⁾ What, then, is the proper "end of man", his "felicity"? ⁽⁴⁾ Martyr answers, human felicity is not related to virtue, but to the forgiveness of sins.

In this our righteousness consists, that our sins should not be imputed unto us, but the righteousness of Christ will be imputed to believers. (in Rom. 8.25)

the image of God is the new man, who understands divine truth, and seeks His righteousness. (in I Cor. 11,17)

A "twofold knowledge of God" there may be, but one is a barren and cold knowledge, a "groping in the dark", since even where, as in philosophy, the existence of God may be posited, His nature and property are so described that "one may well conclude that there is no God". ⁽⁵⁾

We hold a twofold knowledge of God: but the one perception is common and by nature, which is thus slight and infirm, valid only to render men inexcusable ... The other is had through faith, and depends on the Word of God and divine revelation. And this, which alone brings rebirth through Christ, is thus effectual, to transmute souls and make us partakers of the divine nature. (in I Cor. 1.21)

God ... continually holds open before our eyes the book of created things: He always calls and illuminates us: but we always turn away our mind from His doctrine. (in Rom. 1.19)

the knowledge of Thee may be grafted and imprinted in men's minds by the form, order and most beautiful comeliness of the things that are created ... hereunto are added Thy written laws ... But as we are lewd

-
1. in Gen. 1.2: Patres putarent hic esse Spiritus sancti habitam rationem, ut tres personae ad rerum creationem concurrerent, pater, verbum et spiritus.
 2. in Iud. 6.22; of in Gen. 1.26f, in Rom. 5.19: man's destiny is to be the vicarius of God on earth.
 3. Enc. Verbi Dei.
 4. in Arist. Ethic., passim. The true princeps facultas or ἀρχιτεκτονικὴ is found in Scripture alone, whose wisdom is the sole path to the chief end of man. of in I Cor., Praef.: theology, not civil science is the true architectonic: "since this science of ours treats of nothing else but Christ, it is so much the more to be judged the head of all others, as Christ is the most excellent above all other things".
 5. in Rom. 1.19; of 8.25.

and wicked wretches, so have we never made an end of abusing both these most faithful schoolmasters ... (Prayers, Psalm 19 (2))

In this context a basic principle of Peter Martyr's theology is operative, the distinction per se and per accidens.

Things should be named by that which they obtain by their own disposition and nature, and not by what is annexed to them, as they say, by accident or chance. The Gospel has by its own institution and by God's counsel, the property to save. But when it harms, this happens externally, that is by the unfaithfulness of the receivers, otherwise Christ could not be called Saviour, since He was set for the fall and offence of many. (in Rom. 1.16)

Revelation is single, it is entirely good news, the self-revelation of the loving God. Its effect in rendering man inexcusable is not properly an effect, if we regard the Aristotelian distinction of ends, for this is accidental to the Gospel as final cause.

The Gospel is a glad tidings: by this Christ comes to us and makes us glad ... Christ comes not to do harm, but brings His gifts and never comes empty. (Serm. in Ioan. XX)

There is no need to imagine that God has towards us two faces or two heads. He is always the same God, and bears one manner of countenance, although not perceived in the same way by all. For the faithful behold Him one way, and the unfaithful another. (in I Sam. 5.7)

This distinction is decisive in understanding the Law. For it is spiritual, and increases sin only accidentally, through human sin - "the Gospel also might be called the instrument of death".⁽¹⁾ And in the doctrine of predestination Peter Martyr sounds the same note:

under the name of predestination, we will comprehend the saints only ... the Scriptures nowhere that I know call men that shall be damned, predestinate. (De Praedestinatione 10.14)

The fountainhead of predestination is love, so that the order is "love, election, predestination"; it is part of "the Spirit and grace" - the efficient cause of

1. in Rom. 8.2; of in Arist. Eth. I.8 (p 269): the law brings death not per se since suapte ingenio it is life and righteousness; and p 289, per se ... temere seu per accidens.

life only, of union with Christ:

'Whom He has loved in Christ'. This we add because whatever God gives or decrees to give, He gives and will give through Christ ... He is the prince and head of all the predestinate, indeed none is predestinate except to this end alone, to be made a member of Christ.
(De Praed. 12)

Thus revelation is single, and the cause of sin is rather deficient than efficient:

in one way He may be called the author of those things afterwards evilly performed: yet not the true cause, for the proper cause is inward, that is namely their evil will.
(in I Sam. 16.22, An Deus Sit Causa ... Peccati)

The relevance of this teaching for the doctrine of the sacraments will be obvious. Is there a damning or destructive (damnosa et perniciosa manducatio) eating of the Body of Christ, as both Romanist and Lutheran maintained? Martyr answers,

Whatever the Lord instituted, He did that we should be saved ... The eating of the body of Christ, which indeed Scripture hands down, is always a saving manducation. (Defensio adv. Gardin. p 340)

There may be a twofold effect resulting from a twofold manner of eating, but this remains firm -

only one effect results from eating the flesh of Christ ... The flesh of Christ is always vivifying. (Def. 342)

It is a device of your own, to say that there is a certain body of Christ which the wicked eat, yet have not salvation, nor are partakers of the Spirit of Christ. (Disputatio, II, final speech)

In this whole teaching, however, we have still to examine the fundamental assumption of Peter Martyr with regard to revelation. We have mentioned that for him, the Person of Christ is the archetype of theological doctrine, and in the next two Chapters we shall examine this material form in detail. But first we must set forth his profound view of revelation as the divine accommodation to the human creaturely-sinful need in terms of earthly images or signs, and the resultant nature of revelation as analogical.

The Divine Condescension.

Since God in His own nature is not perceived by sense, He yet condescends to human capacity, and by sensible words shows Himself to be known by men, in corporeal forms and in Sacraments.

(Proposit. ex Exod. 3, nec. 4)

For Peter Martyr, the imago Dei is not a static human deposit but a dynamic Divine activity: God "images Himself". The very fact that there is human knowledge of God is a wonderful testimony of the Divine love.

God so humbled Himself as to enter into a covenant with man: that comes from His own mere mercy and goodness. (in Iud. 2.23)

Knowledge of God means condescension, accommodation, humility on God's part; and exaltation, a being lifted up by the Holy Spirit on ours. Thus revelation by Word and Spirit rests firmly upon the Incarnation, Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and upon the office of the Holy Spirit as He joins men to Christ according to this same pattern. We shall approach this teaching by first examining the treatise De Visionibus,⁽¹⁾ an analysis of knowledge of God.

Knowledge of God is not offered to the senses, since the things understood by them, "have no affinity with God, but are most distant from Him". The qualities or accidents of human cognition cannot be carried over to the knowledge of God, "since God, who is most simple, is not subject to these".

The effects which Philosophers use to know God by their understanding are not equal to His dignity, power and faculties. Wherefore they only declared certain things common and light. But we give to Him attributes or properties, that is, good, just, fair, wise and so on; because we have nothing more excellent, nor names more noble, which can be better applied or agree with Him. Nor yet are these things so in Him as we speak: for, since He is most simple, He is far otherwise good, just and wise than men either are or are called.

There is a fundamental agnosticism in human knowledge of God: man cannot attribute properties unto God properly, but by a certain figure, which Martyr usually terms anthropopatheia.

1. in Iud., following 6.22

this cannot agree at all with God, Who is purus actus, nor suffers any variations or changes. And so they are said of Him through ἀνθρωπομορφία, not properly. (in I Sam. 1.19)

So is it said that God contracted His soul and was in a way sorry for the miseries of His people. This kind of speech is not proper to God, but improper. For God is not sorry, nor touched with affections. Wherefore it is a speech after the condition of men. (in Iud. 10.15)

Thus God "is said to" operate in the heavens, He "is said to" descend to signify His presence on earth. (1) In the Treatise, Martyr explains this attribution of properties:

But the Holy Scriptures, if they sometimes attribute members to God, doubtless this is the only reason, to help our infirmity: although we cannot comprehend the essence of God in itself, yet by this is provided that by certain symbols and shadows we may understand somewhat. Wherefore members are by a most profitable metaphor attributed to God, that diligently remembering His properties, we may piously and faithfully exercise our minds.

And again:

Here we should regard the goodness of God, by which He so humbled Himself to our infirmity, that since we cannot understand His nature, He would under the name of members or parts open or rather shadow unto us certain of His properties. (in Iud. 8.24)

The Anthropomorphites, therefore, could not be condemned if they had retained this impropriety as a characteristic of their teaching, in relation to God's condescension to human infirmity.

But they contended that the nature of God was so in very deed: wherefore they are condemned rightly and worthily.

These two ideas form the context of Peter Martyr's doctrine of the sacraments: that the invisible God images Himself according to creaturely forms; and that His

1. in Lament. 1.13; in Gen. 11.5.

relation to these forms is not one of identity but of a certain ratio or proportion. (1)

In speaking of the Ark as "a sacrament of the presence of divine help", Martyr states that because the Papists bind the sign and thing signified, "they follow a ratio alien from piety" (2) - faith involves the sacramental-analogical relationship by its very nature. Revelation leads to faith, not sight; to analogy, not identity; to the Holy Spirit, not human cognition. Revelation poses us with the problem of the meaning of earthly signs.

By this is the excellent power of God known, when He shows forth incredible acts by abject and vile instruments ... So Christ healed the blind man with clay, and God in the signs of water and outward elements of bread and wine stirs up the faith of His people, and seals the promises of heavenly things.

(Enc. Verbi Dei)

Peter Martyr therefore warns us that no creature can have life in itself as a fountain or principle, but only as an organ or instrument of the Divine power: otherwise we mix heaven and earth. (3) The problem of mediation is the problem of human need and the loving accommodation of God to fulfil that need - not the participation of creatures in the being and power of the Creator.

For since we are weak, nor easily believe the promises of God, it was needful that His goodwill towards us should be not only signified by words, but also sealed by things that could be offered to our senses. (in Rom. 4.11)

So God put His words in the Scriptures and in the action of the mysteries. Scripture and Sacrament are the foci of the problem of mediation, although both are forms of the Word of God.

1. cf in I Sam. 29.6, a distinction between names of God substantialia (signifying Jehovah as summum Ens) and proprietary. Of the latter he states, "Other names refer to some property of God ... yet these are not accidents in God: but only in proportion as we grasp them by our thinking. For since God is infinite, and we cannot grasp the whole, yet from the effects and notes we comprehend in some part". cf in 15.11, Deus Quomodo Poenitere Dicatur, Fol. 85B ff.
2. in II Sam. 15.24.
3. Def. 334

Mediation is related to human creatureliness as well as to human sinfulness; for the body is part of God's good creation, and revelation acknowledges this fact.

And I allow what is commonly spoken, 'Sacraments are visible words', they stir men up through the sight and other senses. Chrysostom rightly says, If we were spirit, we should not need those organs, but we are composed of spirit and body, the senses of the body excite the soul. (De Poenitentia 12)

Flesh is the workshop of spirit, as Cyprian rightly says. (Caro est officina spiritus) (De Votis, 1483)

Basically, it is human capacity to which God accommodates Himself in revelation, although as we shall see, Peter Martyr qualifies this thought in an absolute way in relation to the Incarnation. Man is bodily, he is creature:

The body from our first creation was not given men to be an hindrance to our knowledge of God, nor yet to shut up our souls in a kind of dark and blind prison ... (in Iud. 6.22)

A human figure is attributed to God by the Prophets ... But they spoke thus so as to submit to human capacity. (in Lament. 2.1)

We must not take offence, (Augustine) says, that God has so instructed us in knowledge of Himself through a glass as it were, and in dark sayings: since our nature so required it. For we are framed in such a way that we are led to the knowledge of causes by their effects, and are trained to certain truths by similitudes. (in I Cor. 13.12.)

This is the first orientation of similitude or analogy, to bodily infirmity, ⁽¹⁾ as the method of Scripture abundantly testifies:

the Scriptures do not use exquisite and subtle arguments: and rarely do they bring those most perfect demonstrations, since in respect of God, vision must be accommodated to the doctrinal capacity of the weak. For this reason a good part of its doctrine is composed of parables, narratives and similes. (in Arist. Eth. pp 49f)

Thus too, the articles of our faith acknowledge our inability "to comprehend Him fully", but we are given "sometimes some little taste and feeling of Him, sometimes

1. The body is "a most excellent workmanship of God" - if the heathen belief be true, that the union of soul and body is evil, "then let every man who is wise lay violent hands on himself, in order to obtain that commodity!" (in I Cor. 15.12). Body is not the prison but "the most fit instrument" of the soul (in Rom. 8.11): thus instrumentality is posited in the very bodily-soul unity. of in II Reg. 2.21, 3.27 and De Resurrectione in Ch. 4: the soul is the forma of the body.

another." (1) In this connection we may note Peter Martyr's teaching on the resurrection knowledge of God. His stress on the value of the body and its place in the Kingdom of Christ present and future means that our eyes "shall not attain to the essence of God" -

In the life everlasting the blessed shall know the essence of God, not indeed by the senses but by the soul or mind ... not that the blessed shall know in complete perfection the nature and substance of God: for finite things cannot fully receive what is infinite, nor is the creature able to comprehend fully and perfectly his Creator.
(De Visionibus)

It is also in relation to human sinfulness that such accommodation is to be understood; and this is the decisive relation, as the issue of the Incarnational movement of humility in Death indicates. Our felicity cannot be to have knowledge of God "engraved on our minds" by the Spirit apart from "outward writings and the aid of books" because of the brokenness of communion with God through sin. (2)

But it was our sin that removed us from the sight of God; from this came to us the darkness, blindness and ignorance in heavenly things.
(in Iud. 6.22)

Christ, the Redeemer, and man's union with Him, is thus the central meaning of mediation. Speaking of Christ, Martyr states:

He ought chiefly to be called figurator, Who while we live here takes heed of our infirmity through His kindness, in figures. (Def. 14)

there are enough of God's images extant: for Christ is His lively image; let us behold Him and His acts, and in Him we shall know God abundantly.
(in Iud. 8.24)

This thought is summed up best in the Preface to the Tractatio:

And therefore the Holy Spirit, to remedy our weakness, having granted us light and understanding that should excel our own nature, has also humbled Himself to these metaphors, namely of abiding, dwelling, eating and drinking: so that this divine and heavenly union that we have with Christ may in some way be known to us.

-
1. Catech. 1.
 2. Enc. Verbi Dei.

He continues by indicating the two extremes in interpreting these metaphors, of attributing to them too much or too little, simple identity or simple difference. But the spiritual interpretation demands a mean between these, "according to the analogy and convenience of the holy Scripture", which is - "the hypostatic or essential unity of Christ". Here are the three factors in Peter Martyr's doctrine of sacrament: the problem of revelation or mediation, namely the relation between sign and signification; the solution of this problem according to the relationship of analogy, that is, that the sign is not simply identical with or different from, the thing signified, but related analogically to it; and the distinctive divine analogy of the Person of Christ as the given archetype for Christian theology.

Disparates and Analogy.

Those things which are so discrete or disparate, if an analogy or signification occurs, may now be so conjoined that they will be valid to make a proposition. (Tract. 39)

The introduction of analogy as the relation between the revelatory terms means that univocal and equivocal terms are denied in our knowledge of God, for analogy is the mean between these. In his Commentary on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics, Peter Martyr deals explicitly with the meaning of analogy.⁽¹⁾ His teaching may be summarized as follows. First he distinguishes homonyms or univocals (*ὁμωνύμα*, univoca), things having common both the name and the definition; synonyms or equivocals (*συμῶνυμα*, aequivoca), things having common the name but not the definition; and "between these two a medium, commonly called analogue in the schools". In this last, the same ratio agrees with both, and the name is communicated from

-
1. in Arist. Eth. I.6 (pp 135ff, 150f) and II.6 (321ff). Unfortunately, Martyr's work extends only to III.2, and so does not reach the locus classicus of analogy, the treatment of the concept of Justice in Book V, esp. II. 1130ff. Nevertheless, these passages from his Commentary (although given only coincidental to the Aristotelian text, and not in systematic form like the teaching of Aquinas on the same subject), should prove a most valuable source for the understanding of the sacramental-analogical nature of revelation, not only in his own thought, but perhaps in that of the Reformation as a whole.

one to the other. What is proper to the one is through the definition or signification applied to the other term. (1)

A further distinction is made within analogy itself. (2) Having rejected homonymy or univocity as the mode of relation of disparates, he now distinguishes a mode according to which the definition can be common other than "absolutely or perfectly, as it ought to be in Synonyms". Thus pure equivocation is rejected, and the way cleared for the presentation of analogy proper. "There are these three forms of analogy": first, when things of the same name participate also in the same ratio, not simpliciter and by nature, but because they proceed from one common principle (example: things medica, including both surgical instruments and books); second, things making for the same end share the same name and ratio, such as things sana making for sanitas, although as various as exercise and blood-letting.

The third form is Analogy, which is clear enough from the example adduced in the text concerning the mind and the eye, where it is first determined about analogy or proportion that it holds itself, as the eye to the body, so the mind to the soul. Next is to be seen whether the one is the good of that in which it is, and the good in this way, whether through itself or the other, as we say, What the eye is to the body, the mind is to the soul: but the eye is the good of the body: and therefore the mind is such a good of the soul. In this way are these shown to agree not only in name, but in ratio, yet only by analogy.

A third passage (3) relates this teaching to the Greek distinction between the arithmetical mean, the medium rei, which is invariable and unchangeable, "equally distant from both extremes" (simple proportion), and the geometrical mean, the medium quo ad nos. The latter compares two ratios or proportions, for instance in the proposition "as six is to three, so eight is to four", the ratio vel

-
1. pp 135f.
 2. pp 150f. The context is Aristotle's question whether a common definition implies a common idea, or an magis secundum proportionem? Quemadmodum in corpore visus, ita in animo mens, et aliud in alio.
 3. pp 523f. Proportio autem nil aliud est quam collatio inter se magnitudinum AUT numerorum (324). This is the Ciceronic term conlatio rationis; cf in II Sam. 4.11, Jerome: aliquem bifariam posse appellari iustum: vel simpliciter, vel ex collatione.

proportio is two. The medium Geometricum is therefore defined as "the likeness of ratio or proportion".⁽¹⁾ Therefore, for Peter Martyr the mode of relating two disparate or disjunctive terms is neither simple univocity nor pure equivocity, nor yet analogy of a determinate (arithmetical) relationship, but analogy as likeness of proportion. He accepts the Aristotelian concept of analogy which follows the Greek classic definition of the medium geometricum.

Before considering the implications of this concept, and our reason for dealing with it at length here, we ought to note the striking similarity of Martyr's thought on this point with that of Thomas Aquinas. Aquinas rejects univocal predication^a "of God and other things", and the "purely equivocal", distinguishing this latter from the analogical means of predication.⁽²⁾ Within the analogical, moreover, he distinguishes things in relation to some other thing, and things in relation to one of themselves, the latter being the only form of analogy proper to God and other things. The proper predication within analogy is of one term to the other (analogia quae est unius ad alterum). The final distinction is between proportion, which requires a determinate relationship between the terms, and proportionality, which is "a likeness of proportion" presupposing "an analogy of similitude".⁽³⁾ In all this teaching, we may conclude that Aquinas and Peter Martyr are faithful interpreters of Aristotle as to the doctrine of analogy. G.B. Phelan has stated, "Since Cajetan's De Nominum Analogia it is customary to deal with the doctrine of analogy in the philosophy of St. Thomas under the general headings of analogy of inequality, analogy of attribution and analogy of proportionality - which correspond

1. of W.D. Ross, 'Aristotle', pp 210ff regarding the critical section of Book V. In a significant footnote he states, "Originally the Greeks seem to have recognized three means (μετρίαιρες), the arithmetical, the geometrical, and the harmonic, and only one ἀναλογία, the geometrical. Later, they applied ἀναλογία to all three cases".
2. "This mode of community (sc. analogy) is the mean between pure equivocation and simple univocation" - Summa Theol. I. 13.5.
3. S.T. I. Q iv. a. 3; xiv - xxxiv (Dominican transl.)

exactly with the three types of analogy which St. Thomas himself distinguished in his Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard".⁽¹⁾

What is the significance of this coincidence of concepts and even of phrases in the teaching of these two men? Briefly, we may say that for the Romanist, analogy remains a static concept of logic, whereas for the Reformed theologian, analogy becomes dynamic. Aquinas relates the concept of analogy he had learned from Aristotle to the theory of degrees of reality: for him, it is the analogy of being which is the decisive category.⁽²⁾ Now Martyr is well aware of the significance of the analogia entis in relation to the order of categories. These, he says, do not share a common nature ex aequo, for

being is spoken of them not on even terms but by a certain ratio, whence an analogy is said to be ascribed to them: for substance is the first of all, in it the other categories belong and upon it they lean. (in Arist. Eth. p 138)

But Martyr does not rest in this sphere of deliberation: revelation is for him something more than a problem of epistemology. For revelation is essentially "by Word and Spirit", and it is the givenness of its content which reverses the Reformer's analogical theology so that it becomes Christology in action. The Incarnation, in its twofold nature of God and Man in one hypostasis, and its twofold nature in history as Death and Resurrection - this is the Analogue of God.⁽³⁾

-
1. 'Saint Thomas and Analogy, The Aquinas Lectures, 1941', Milwaukee, p 26. Moreover, "proper proportionality" is to be distinguished not only from attribution (in which only the prime analogue "formally possesses the characteristic signified by the analogated ratio" - p 37), but also from improper proportionality or symbolic analogy. Phelan characterizes Meister Eckhart as attributive, and Maimonides as symbolic, analogical thinking (p 42).
 2. cf R.L. Patterson, 'The Conception of God in the Philosophy of Aquinas' (London, 1933), esp. Chapter 7.
 3. cf. "All knowledge of God is analogical and sacramental, not direct. This is what revelation means. But it is axiomatic with the Reformers that the analogy must be chosen by God Himself to be the medium of His revelation. In this sense Jesus Christ, the Scriptures, preaching and the sacraments are analogies". T.H.L. Parker, 'The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God' (Oliver and Boyd, 1952) p 109.

The Romanist doctrine of analogia entis is the starting-point for God's accommodation, the possibility of the Incarnation of Deity, "receptive and ready to be used by Him".⁽¹⁾ And although its adherents may at times approach an understanding of the archetypal nature of the Person of Christ,⁽²⁾ yet fundamentally they walk by sight, by their creaturely continuity of being with God, and not by faith, by the gracious Event in which God has bound Himself to man, and bound us to Him in this Man. These are the lines along which the battle was fought in the Reformation, as we shall see from Martyr's struggles in the eucharistic controversies. Here his weapon against the Romanists is this very concept of analogy so ably worked out by Aquinas - but the decisive factor is the acceptance of the Person of Christ as the archetypal analogue given from God's side. His solution of every theological problem was sought in God's redemptive solution, the Person of Christ. From grace to faith, and only then to being, this was his method: the Person of Christ, the office of the Holy Spirit, and our union with Christ.

The Holy Spirit and the 'Sursum Corda'.

It is against such a background that Peter Martyr's analogical solution to the problem of the sacramental relationship is to be approached. Briefly, he states that the sign and the thing signified are related according to the "likeness of proportion" indicated by Aristotle's analysis.

We acknowledge that disparates cannot be predicated of themselves by mutual identity, as the Scholastics say, when both are taken properly ... But if the predicate is understood analogically, through signification, it can rightly be predicated of the other.
(Def. 667).

It is necessary that some analogy, that is proportion or convenience should be retained between the sign and the thing signified. For if signs had no similitude with those things that are signified, then they should not be their signs. And yet along with this conformity

-
1. P.E. Przywara, 'Polarity' (London, 1935), pp 72f.
 2. e.g. Przywara states, "The 'two unfused as one' of classical Christology is preeminently the form of these solutions in general", i.e. Grace and Free Will etc. - op.cit. p 85.

there is still to be kept a diversity between what is signified and the things which signify. (in Rom. 4.11)

The implications are obvious: neither a simple identity nor a simple difference, nor yet a relation of proportion, but a relation of likeness (and diversity) of proportion.

This relation of analogy is essentially the sacramental relation. On the key verse, Romans 12.6, for instance, he considers Origen's rejection of the translation "according to the ratio of faith" because Origen "counts analogy to be a competent measure", and comments, "analogy can most properly be rendered ratio". (1)

Again he states:

Nor is there a conjunction between the symbol and the thing signified, unless sacramental ... nor may you remove the ratio or analogy between the sign and the thing signified.

(in I Cor. 11.24)

we have always taught thus, that the whole and complete Sacrament consists of sign and thing signified. For there can be no relation without two terminates. But the Sacrament is a certain relation between such, namely the outward symbol which we observe by eye and sense, and the things signified, which are eternal, heavenly and invisible. (Def. 534)

Yet the decisive thing has still to be said. That is, the office of the Holy Spirit in this sacramental-analogical operation. In a very clear passage, Martyr points out that there is not sufficient natural analogy for us to comprehend the thing itself; for this there is required a constituting authority, the Word of God, and an effectual signification, the Holy Spirit's work: "for assuredly by the Spirit of God, not by human reason" we derive the signification of such signs. (2)

This is obviously true of Scripture:

Those who come to hear the Gospel, and lack faith, receive nothing but words: and the Gospel is to them no Gospel ... both the words of God and the sacraments, if received only as outward things, pertain to the letter, which quickens not but kills. (in Rom. 1.16, 2.28)

1. Comm. ad loc.

2. Def. 2.

the letter kills, but the spirit vivifies, since everything kills which is offered us without the Spirit of Christ ... Even the Gospel, if read when not supplied with the Spirit of Christ, is the letter and kills. For these outward things only teach, damn, accuse, reveal sins. (in Lament., Praef.)

In reading Scripture, our minds must be "lifted up from things temporal to things eternal and heavenly". (1) But also in the Sacrament, no earthly security is offered, the relation between sign and signification remains the same. The revelation by Word and Spirit is never superseded, so that here too what is required is the movement of faith, which is always the "lifting up of the heart" unto Christ in the heavens. The power in the sacrament is the power of the Holy Spirit - Peter Martyr's constant theme is the presence and power of the Spirit of Christ. The formal analogy becomes a positive error unless the Holy Spirit "fills" its terms with the proportion between God and man given to faith in the Person of Jesus Christ.

Along with this insistence upon the centrality of the office of the Holy Spirit in all our knowledge of God and Christian life, Peter Martyr places the complementary insistence upon the unio hypostatica of the Person of Christ as the ground of all our knowledge and life. This is directly opposed to the ontological basis of Romanist thought, since it means the action of God in time and history, His dynamic redemptive acts rather than His static ontological being. It is in this twofold way that Peter Martyr "fills" the analogy he found in Aristotle, by relating it in an absolute way to the revelation by Word and Spirit. Now therefore we must examine his treatment of the historical record of this revelation: the presence of Christ in the Old and New Testaments.

1. in I Sam. 2.10; cf Def. 2: the words of the Bible are analogical signs and require the work of the Holy Spirit to be understood.

CHAPTER II : CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT SIGNA.

"Every Speech of God."

For the Son of God is named by the Evangelist the Word or *λόγος*, which we must believe was not done by him rashly, but that it might be understood that God spoke by Him, when Scripture testifies that He spoke. Wherefore as often as we read that the Word of the Lord came to this man or that, I judge that this is always to be attributed unto the Son of God. (in Iud. 6.22)

Peter Martyr's doctrine of the unity of Scripture is but the logic of his Christology applied to the Biblical witness. God's self-revelation is by Word and Spirit: and the Word is not merely instrumental, but is Himself the substance of revelation. (1) Whether Old Testament or New, the matter (res) is one and the same. The unity of Scripture is the unity of Christ. There are, however, two distinct-ions which must be noted: between Law and Gospel, and between substance and acci-dents of the two testaments.

Martyr's works are full of this thought of the oneness of revelation:

whatever things are said to have been spoken by God in the Old Testament, the same were made open by Christ. (in Iud. 2.1)

those things which happened then were done by the Son of God ... what-ever is uttered unto men concerning divine things is uttered by the Son of God, Who has indeed given Himself to mankind, a faithful inter-preter of God His Father. (De Iustificatione, 80)

the Son of God, the word and voice of God by whom He speaks.
(in Gen. 3.8)

Moreover, the Son subsumes under Himself all forms of revelation, including that by angels: sometimes angels appear in His name and in His power, but sometimes also

-
1. cf in I Cor. 10.3 regarding the substance or subject of revelation: Christ is the res in all sacraments, since O.T. sacraments had the same two things, symbola and res per ea significata. But only those who approach religiose are led from the one to the other. "Whence we acknowledge that all speech (sermo) which we read that God shared with men, is to be referred to the Son of God, Who is Christ: just as the Father neither speaks nor represents His will, save through the Word".

Christ Himself appears as an angel:

When in the Old Testament, as often happens, the name of angel is joined with the name of God, then is meant the second Person of the Trinity, the Son. (Prop. ex Exod. 3, prob.1)

Doubtless Christ was that angel that defended the Jews and fought on their side. (in Iud. 4.15)

Fundamentally, the authority of the Old Testament is equal with that of the New, since it too is the revelation of the Son of God.

Christ has given to His Church the Old Testament, whose authority - let Manichees, Marcionites and other such pestilent heretics chafe at it all they want - is most stable and sure, inasmuch as by it the ancient Christians also discerned the New Testament. (in I Cor., Praef.)

This "discerning the new Testament" is the key to the O.T. significance. Ultimately, the parts of Scripture are not Old and New, but Law and Gospel, distinct not historically but theologically:

it is not lawful to divide the holy books from one another ... whatever is contained in the holy Scriptures should be referred to two chief points, I mean law and gospel. For everywhere, either God's commandments to live well are set forth unto us, or else when we are found to depart from them through weakness or malice of some sort, the gospel is revealed, in which through Christ we are pardoned our trespasses, and promised the power and strength of the Holy Spirit, to restore us again to the image of Christ that we had lost. These two things may be seen in all the books of Moses, in the histories, in the prophets and books of wisdom, and throughout the whole testament, old and new. (in Iud., Praef.)

At the same time there is given the law and Christ, for the one shows forth the other. (in Gen. 2.16)

the law and the Gospel are not separated by volumes of books. For in the Old Testament are contained the promises of the Gospel, and in the Gospel the law is not only comprehended, but also most perfectly expounded by Christ. (De Iustif. 33)

The New Testament does not signify grace as against law, although following Pentecost "a more ample Spirit and more plentiful grace" were given⁽¹⁾ - rather "it is not the law that is abrogated, but the domination and power which follow it".⁽²⁾

-
1. in Gen. 21.23.
 2. in Rom. 3, 20.

The Incarnation meant a new power and freedom; this is that towards which all the divine promises point, namely the Birth of Christ, ⁽¹⁾ and it is the sum of Scripture:

Assuredly the highest benefit of God towards mankind is Christ:
wherefore all other things must be reduced wholly to this point.
(in I Sam. 2.10)

The O.T. Saints as Members of Christ.

as He is said to live in us, since we are His members, so also He lived and dwelt in the old fathers: wherefore they were no less His members than are we. And how the Head suffers and is renewed in His members, is most clearly declared to Paul - 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?' (in Rom. 10.4)

The unity of the Word of revelation implies a corresponding unity in the meaning of justification and faith. For the content of faith is always the same: union with Christ. Faith is "the power by which we apprehend Christ", ⁽²⁾ and for Peter Martyr this apprehension involves the whole Christ, Divine and Human, and the whole man, body and soul. The apprehension of faith is based upon Christ's union with men, which He has accomplished in a twofold way. ⁽³⁾ By His Incarnation, Christ effected a "general union" with all mankind, weak and "material" but real and of ultimate significance for revelation. By "the Spirit and grace" however, He effects a second union (coniunctio spiritu et per gratiam) of a very close nature:

we are so joined with Christ that we are called flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bones; because through the Incarnation we are made of the same nature and kind as He; and afterwards, His grace and Spirit coming to us, we are made partakers of His spiritual conditions and properties. (in I Cor. 12.12)

The Church is the sphere of this ingrafting into Christ on the basis of His union with humanity by Incarnation and by His Spirit. But does not this presuppose the Incarnation as historical actuality, and so deny the O.T. saints membership

-
1. in Gen. 22.13.
 2. in I Cor. 13.3; cf De Iustif. 71 - faith is defined in terms of its Object, Christ the Redeemer and Lord.
 3. Letters to Calvin and Beza (L.C. 1094, 1108); cf Chapter 5 below.

in this same Christ which we have for our Head? To this Peter Martyr answers in strong terms: Christ is not only the prime Actor in the O.T., as we noted above, but He is this on account of His coming Incarnation, and in relation to it. Therefore before and after the Incarnation the substance of revelation - and so of our union with Christ - is one and the same.

The whole Church and right faith confess that the Word was the true God that appeared under the flesh of man. If He did this, as doubtless He did without counterfeit, why may He not be said to have done the same in the Old Testament under various forms and many figures? Without doubt that was much greater which He gave us in the latter time. But He that gave us the greater thing can surely also give us the lesser. (De Vision.)

The O.T. forms are thus related to the Incarnation according to the inner pattern of revelation - the future Incarnation is their possibility. The sacrifices, for instance are not mere symbols:

In the kids and goats offered, Christ could be expressed because of the form of perfect man which He assumed.

(Prop. ex Levit. 1, prob. 5)

And what of the appearance in human form in the O.T.? We must first acknowledge the unique nature of the Incarnation itself:

The similitude of angels appearing in human form must not be compared with the Incarnation of the Lord.

(in I Cor. 15.47, An Christ. ex Coel. ...)

When Christ Himself appeared "in visible species" it was because Abraham, for instance, required confirmation "by some effective indication of the divine presence."⁽¹⁾

And such visible forms are different in kind from the Incarnation:

But before, when He appeared to Abraham and to the Fathers, although He had true flesh, yet because it was not joined to Him in one and the same substance, He could not be called flesh, nor was flesh God. But afterwards, when He took upon Him both flesh and soul, so that there was but one substance or person, then man was God and God, man.

(in Iud. 13, 25, De Vis. Angel.)

With this qualification in mind, Peter Martyr now declares the basic oneness of the

presence of Christ:

Since Christ was to come and was to be offered for us on the Cross, He was in this way comprehended by the Fathers, by faith, and was food for their souls unto life eternal. For those things which are furthest away from us, this same faith makes present, so that they take hold of the same Christ which we at this time enjoy.

(in I Sam. 1.4)

although He had not yet in actual fact taken flesh upon Him, yet was He given spiritually for meat to the Fathers who believed in the promise. (Tract. 9)

Grace and faith are the same in every age - this is the determinative category for Peter Martyr.⁽¹⁾ It is the gracious condescension of the Divine Person in revelation and redemption which is the content of faith: how can this differ from one age to the next?

The death of Christ, the shedding of His blood, and the assumption of the flesh were always present, unalterable, pleasing and welcome, as God (qua Deus). Wherefore in the Apocalypse it is said 'a lamb slain from the foundation of the world', and to the Hebrews, 'Christ the same yesterday and today and forever'. And of Abraham it is declared in the Gospel, that he saw the day of Christ and rejoiced. Whence that connection is not firm, that 'The flesh and blood of Christ had not yet been assumed through the economy or dispensation of time, and therefore they could not be spiritual food and drink to the ancients'. For, since the salvation of the Fathers, just as ours, depended on the death and blood of Christ, it was necessary for them, as for us, to grasp these by faith: else salvation they did not have. Although the death, flesh and blood of Christ, were not yet extant in nature, nevertheless the Fathers could have their force and efficacy to serve them ... They had present the divine person, that is the Son of God, Whom they grasped by faith, and indeed grasped in this promise, or as I may say, in respect of the human nature which He would assume.

(in I Cor. 10.4)

Martyr's Christology, it will be noted, is dynamic: Christ is present as spiritual nourishment, He is grasped in a union which is a communion. The Incarnation is the great pattern and source of this union and communion, but since it means a sacramental relationship to man, it can equally well sustain such a relationship

1. Faith is God's instrument "to apply Christ unto ourselves" so that we are "grafted into Christ" (De Iustific. 71) - but "that faith, in which justification consists, is the same in both testaments" (in Rom. 11.27)

proleptic to its historical actuality. Thus Christ's union with the O.T. saints is identical in kind with that after the Incarnation: He is the substance of their faith, His human nature the mediating term in revelation, His communication of His qualities their sanctification. Their "second righteousness" following conversion reforms them according to the image of Christ,⁽¹⁾ and therefore in the life of the O.T. saints too "we see an express image of the Cross and Resurrection of Christ".⁽²⁾

It is this dual fact of Christ's union with His members and their reflection of His image, which is the basis of Peter Martyr's typological interpretation of the Old Testament.

Typology, Allegory and Analogy.

Peter Martyr consistently holds that a valid knowledge of Christ is to be gained from the study of the lives and deeds of the O.T. saints. The "argument and scope" of any passage includes two things, the historical events and the pointing to Christ, since "in all these things Christ is celebrated".⁽³⁾

So far ought we thus to deal with the historical exposition, that we may understand in every act, what is set forth in the sacred books for our consideration. Two things are first to be pondered, the persons by whom the deeds are done, then the deed itself ... what part (persona) they bore, what functions were theirs ... so that we should have here two men before our eyes, Abraham and Melchizedec. (in Gen. 14.18)

Abraham is a lesson in piety and trust, Melchizedec in the true priesthood, the sacrifice of thanksgiving. But also each is Christi typus, "between whom and

-
1. of esp. De Iustif., passim - "Because we are justified we do just things"; cf in I Sam. 26.23, the iustitia duplex, imputata et factorum.
 2. in II Sam. 20.1; cf in 22.10-26: the qualities of His saints give a valid knowledge of God, so that Martyr can even say, Summa est, talis est Deus quales homines fuerint.
 3. in II Sam. 22.1: the scopus in all his Commentaries always involves the Person of Christ as chief Actor in the Biblical drama.

Christ many symbols are evident". This latter is most clearly that which profits believers (utilitas sanctorum), indeed it is "the matter and thing itself" of the passage. (1)

In the Epistle Dedicatory of his Commentary on Judges, Peter Martyr sets forth clearly this method.

Further, this is chiefly to be marked, that Jesus Christ the Son of God is not excluded from this sacred history. For since He is the end of the law and sum of the Scriptures, since this book pertains to the law and is a part of the scriptures, it shows and clearly preaches Christ to its readers ... that faith which is natural and sound includes Christ Himself, unto Whom particularly and in one sense only, does it refer. For by Him the promises of God are made effectual. Wherefore while we behold the wonderful acts of the Judges, we should have before our eyes the excellent faith which shone brightly in them, and also the common deliverer of mankind, namely the Son of God Christ Jesus, Whom they beheld as their Captain and Commander. And that not unworthily, for He worked by them, and by them set the people free, in admonishing them by the voices of Angels, and oracles of Prophets, in confirming them in dangers, and at last not inconstantly but faithfully performing these things which He had before most liberally promised. Lastly, when we hear that the Hebrews, who were members of the same Christ, were sometimes oppressed and killed by their enemies, let us in them acknowledge the death and torments of our Head. And in their victories and triumphs, let us behold His resurrection, kingdom and glory. For God has framed unto us wings of His Spirit and Word: but if through our own default we become fleshly and heavy, we shall not be carried up into heaven, but along with animals be drawn downwards.

Here we see the essential doctrines - the two elements in Biblical exposition, the 'sursum corda' by the Holy Spirit as the passage from the one to the other, and all based upon the membership in Christ of the saints in any and every age.

Wherever in Scripture we read of a "private rescue" of the saints, we are to look unto Christ, inasmuch as the lesser is contained in the greater, and the greater is that "principal redemption" of the Incarnate Christ. (2) These lesser

-
1. Haec de personis in hac historia dixisse contenti erimus: quod ad negotium et rem ipsam, videmus quantopere sancti in afflictionibus prosint. The term negotium is Ciceronic, translating the Greek τράπεζα for res. Peter Martyr's Latinity has Cicero for its master.
 2. in Iud., Intro.

patterns of death and resurrection are not only shadows of the greater, but "sure parts", because they have the same author. Therefore "this is no allegory" when he states

Whatever they were that defended the people of God in ancient times, Christ was their Head and Captain. Wherefore whatever they did in defending His members, they did as His ministers and vicars. (in Iud. 1.1)

Peter Martyr is well aware of the allegorical method and its implications, especially as used by Origen, but he explicitly distinguishes his method from it. The Commentaries on Samuel are most valuable on this subject. Simler in the Preface, treating of Martyr's method, states succinctly, "He does not idly play with allegories" (Allegoriis non ludit temere); and in the Preface Martyr sets forth his purpose. There is a threefold end (finis or scopus) of these Books: the life and times of the nation Israel; the divine law, exhibited by these living examples; and the "most useful end of all, namely Christ" who alone is a trustworthy Guide through life. "For Christ alone is the end, not only of the law, but also of all these actions". Now as the greater contains the less, so we ought to look unto Christ when we see the lesser liberations of the Hebrews. In their oppression and affliction, the divine wrath should come to mind, and every eye turn to Christ dying on His Cross:

For whatever may be unto pious men and members of Christ, that without controversy is to be related to Christ Himself.

The basis of this exposition is the fact that Christ is the "fountain and head" of all the earthly benefits. When he exhorts us to "life up our mind from things temporary to things eternal and heavenly", therefore it is not an improper exposition on the basis of allegory, for "those things which in the O.T. were written concerning things temporary pertain to things eternal". Thus "The true David was Christ our Saviour", because "There is therefore a fitting analogy

(collatio) between this David and our true David, Christ Jesus".⁽¹⁾ Peter

Martyr's argument of quemadmodum .. ita is based on the prior fact that Christ is the archetypus:

This we should know, that David shadowed in himself a type of our Saviour Christ. And so in all this history the eyes are to be referred to the archetype. (in I Sam. 17.58)

Peter Martyr's method of interpretation, therefore, is neither allegorical nor "typological" in the common usage of that word, but the analogical exposition of types on the basis of Jesus Christ as archetype, and Head of His members.

I know there are those who object that we cannot expound fitly enough unless we turn aside to allegory. But there is no firm argument here. Rather I reply, this method of exposition which we follow in this place is not properly allegory. For in this history God wishes to describe to us Christ Jesus our Saviour, not less but much more than Solomon.⁽²⁾

His main concern is to see what conforms to Christ (convenire Christo) in the O.T. history. His "typology" is really his sacramental analogy in action. Thus his

terms are significant: not only type, but shadow, image, form, sign and sacrament.⁽³⁾

In all cases, Christ is the signification, the mystery of revelation. He joins Himself to these signs, uniquely to the humanity He took at the Incarnation, but analogical to that union, He "fills" these derivative and lesser signs by the power

1. in I Sam. 2.10, 22.1, 28.1.

2. in II Sam. 7.13: he continues, "Yet are not all allegories useless" and acknowledges a proper use of them. cf in Iud. 7.25, where the battle is taken as an allegory, as Isaiah 9 would suggest: "this victory is to be referred unto that delivery from sin, which we have obtained through Christ. Nor do the trumpets portend anything else than the preaching of the Gospel, now spread abroad over the whole earth ...". Further, on the Hebrew method of allegory. cf in Gen. 26.22.

3. Nohe ... fuit Christi umbra, in Gen. 5.29; imago, in Iud. 16.31, I Sam. 18.11; typus ... et forma, in Gen. 6.18, Lament. 5.2.; signum (and symbolum), in Gen. 35.1, etc. (cf in I Sam. 2.34: when the Word was rarum et pretiosum, outward signs were not necessary, Signa enim instrumenta sunt, quibus homines ad credendum facilius inducuntur); sacramentum, in Gen. 7.19 (ark), 9.17 (rainbow). cf species, in II Sam. 20.1.

of His Spirit. Signs "stir up" and "confirm" faith; they are instruments by which men are led to believe, by which faith is "illuminated and inflamed".⁽¹⁾

Thus the significance of signs is in every age the same: they are instruments of the Holy Spirit.

the Hebrews dedicated and initiated (temples and vessels) not by simple and bare words, but by adding outward rites, signs I mean, and tokens that could be seen - not indeed that they thought any holiness or divine quality was in those things, since they were inanimate and incapable of holiness; but they thought thus, that since the rites were instituted by God, the consecrated things might become instruments of the Holy Spirit, by which men's faith should be stirred up. Nor were they deceived, since those things had the Word of God for that age, and what today is to us water, bread and wine, was for them varied and manifold symbols in holy things.

(in I Reg. 8.66, De Templ. Ded.)

Once again we are in the category of Word and Spirit, and therefore of the necessity for the sursum corda in their right use. For the signification was heavenly as much as is that of the N.T. sacraments.

The old rites before the coming of Christ were testimonies and sure seals of the heavenly gifts, promises and favour of God to be given. For these are spiritual things, nor can they be discerned with outward eyes. (in II Reg. 2.21)

The sacrifices, for instance, Martyr calls, "visible sermons" which taught the people of Christ's Death.⁽²⁾ But too often, the Jews

were amazed at the sacrifices of beasts, neither did they, as was fitting, lift up the eyes of their minds unto Christ.

(in Iud. 11.40)

Yet in general, this signification "was known in those days", and indeed some of the O.T. saints - Abraham, David, Jeremiah and Isaiah for instance - beheld the mystery of Christ with the greatest clearness.⁽³⁾ For the sacrificial system was the schoolhouse of Christ.

1. in I Sam. 2.34, 4.3: ut usu eorum sp. sanct. in nobis fidem illustret et accendat

2. in Iud. 11.40, section concerning Jephtha's vow and human sacrifice; cf for this lifting up of eyes and heart, in I Sam. 2.10, 6.15.

3. in I Sam. 3.14, in I Cor. 10.2.

The Schooling of the Mosaic Sacrifices.

God does not delight in blood per se: but by this pedagogy He taught the people. (in Iud. 11.40)

And that worship was a kind of pedagogy, for the Fathers were taught that the death which they had brought on themselves by their sins, was through the great goodness of God translated from them to the sacrifices. And Christ was clearly manifested, Who took upon Himself all our sins and death, and so died, that we might be absolved. This was the education of the Mosaic sacrifices. (in II Reg. 3.27)

The sacrifices taught two things: the seriousness of sin, its guilt and death, deserved by the sinner but graciously transferred to the innocent sacrifice offered; and secondly,

that Christ should be that sacrifice that was to take away the sins of the world, unto Whom our death and damnation should be transferred. (in Iud. 11.40)

It is unfortunate that Martyr's lecture notes on Leviticus were never published, ⁽¹⁾ but we have his Propositions or summary of his notes. In those we see his doctrine of O.T. sacrifice.

A sacrifice is a ceremony in which something is offered to God according to His precept, to obtain the remission of sins, not only gracious but true, through the faith of Jesus Christ, there represented and exhibited. Faith is accommodated to various promises of God, but what justifies refers to Christ Himself.

When in the Epistle to the Hebrews or elsewhere in the holy Scriptures it is said that the ancient ceremonies gave no remission of sins, that must be understood, by the power of the work, or without faith in Christ. Moses spoke nowhere more plainly of the death of Christ than in the laws of the sacrifices. (Prop. ex Levit. 1, nec. 1-4)

The O.T. sacrifices "draw all their dignity from the sacrifice of Christ". ⁽²⁾

For they consisted of three things, thanksgiving for benefits received, an exhortation to godly living, and "a token and shadow of Christ". ⁽³⁾ Of this last Martyr can speak in the strongest terms:

1. see App. A.
2. in I Cor. 11.20

3. in I Cor. 5.8.

And in every solemn act, through the death of the animal offered in sacrifice, the sacrifice of Christ was apprehended by faith, by which, believing in Him, they were justified. There were also in them a celebration of divine praises, a holy congregation, the administration of the Word of God, the communion of the faithful, and the confession of sins. (in I Cor. 5.8)

The faith of the old Fathers, by which they regarded Christ and embraced Him in the signification of those sacrifices, justified and obtained remission of sins. (in Rom. 11.27)

This doctrine of sacrifice is analogical - it depends on the proper movement from sign to thing signified.

When the old Fathers knew that they were reconciled to God through the sacrifices, and yet understood that the beasts killed were not more excellent in nature than those for whom they were offered, they necessarily concluded that the worthiness of the sacrifices depended on something else: whereupon they fled to the promises of Messiah and acknowledged Him therein to be preferred before them.

(Prop. ex Levit. 1, prob.4)

For what is pleasing to God in the sacrifices is "the thing signified, namely Christ" apart from Whom they are "dead bodies without life". (1) Thus were the sacrifices the chief O.T. signa, ministering "spiritual sanctification" unto the Hebrews inasmuch as it was the "selfsame matter" which they signified - the Death of Christ as the object of faith. (2) The "certain place" whereby the Fathers foreshadowed the mercy of Christ Himself was "not at all less certain" than "what pertained to His corporeal presence". (3)

Meanwhile was the sacrificing: but what were those sacrifices? They ought in the sacrifices to apprehend by faith the future death of Christ. (in II Sam. 15.13)

When faith is removed, all outward things are empty. (in I Cor. 10.7)

For in those beasts killed, Christ's death was manifested to the faith of the Elders ... the faith which embraced Christ in those rites, brought salvation to the Elders, just as today the outward exercises of the sacraments or commandments profits not, but faith alone brings salvation, for it sees that under the enfolding of sensible signs, heavenly gifts are set forth unto us. (in Rom. 3.21)

1. in I Sam. 15.22

3. in Gen. 28.12

2. in I Cor. 10.6.

In the O.T. sacrificial system, therefore, Peter Martyr finds the elements of Christian worship, for the movement of grace and faith is always the same, making present in the union of faith, the Christ Who was to them future and is to us above - neither mode of separation prevents the "effectual signification" by these instruments of the Holy Spirit, of the nourishment of His Person. Thus does sacrifice always pass over into sacrament: the O.T. saint is carried above the sacrificial signs to the vivifying Lord Who unites him to Himself.

The One Sacrament.

That the Fathers were justified we doubt not: and they could not be justified without faith in Christ ... what have we in our sacraments, which we receive as the chief and principal thing? Is it not Christ? But the Apostle testifies that the old Fathers received Him in their sacraments. (in Rom. 8.15)

From the point of view of the substance or matter of the sacraments, their signification, there is but one sacrament, Christ Himself. Christ in His own Person is the Sacrament, in its true sense of mystery, and it is to Him that all sacraments correspond. This is the theme of the next Chapter, but its significance here is that the O.T. sacramental communication is equally a communication of the vivifying and nourishing Person of Jesus Christ.

Many infer ... that the sacraments of the old Fathers were shadows of our sacraments, yet not one with them ... There can be no other matter (res) of the sacraments appointed than Christ Himself. (in I Cor. 10.6)

we grant that with regard to the outward signs, there is some difference between their sacraments and ours: but yet with regard to the things signified by the sacraments, this is found to be nothing at all. (in Iud. 2.23)

the kind of signs might be diverse, but the things signified are not. Indeed there, as among ourselves, Christ Jesus is the same Mediator, outside Whom there is no salvation. Therefore as to nature - or as I may say, substance and essence - the Church of the Jews is the same as ours. (in I Cor. 10.1)

The distinction between the substance and accidents in sacraments - far different from the common scholastic definition! - reflects the nature of the

Covenant:

one and the same covenant between God and man, are the old and new testament ... Briefly, what difference is between the testaments, consists not in the substance of the covenant, but in the accidents.
(in I Sam. 2.10)

Wherefore the substance, matter and Spirit are in either testament one and the same: but there is found some difference in qualities ...
(in Rom. 11.7)

Christ was in the covenant, as the Mediator between both parties.
(in Iud. 2.23, De Foedere)

How false therefore is it to take the O.T. signa either as bare symbols without present power, or as earthly and carnal signs! ⁽¹⁾ For Christ was truly present to the Hebrews:

Sacraments in the Old Testament not only signified but exhibited the grace of God. (Prop ex Gen. 16-17, nec. 5)

When the Prophets and Patriarchs were taught by the Spirit of God, they perceived and contemplated clearly and openly in the Sacraments of the Law both Christ and the redemption given through that gift, with eyes of faith. ⁽²⁾

At this point we should note two questions which are raised by the above outline, and which Martyr himself notes explicitly. ⁽³⁾ First, why are our sacraments of greater force if the substance is thus the same with the O.T. sacraments? Because, he replies, Christ is now given and the sacraments can exhibit a past event. ⁽⁴⁾ Our sacraments are fewer in number, clearer in symbolism, for "more

1. e.g. Def. 54-58: the O.T. is not tota typi, and it is blasphemy to call its sacraments vappae. cf. in I Cor. 10.6, they "were types of our sacraments, but also had the same matter spiritually comprehended"; Def. 702: since their sacraments foreshadowed Christ, they are spiritualis; in Iud. 1.36: "The Jews are occupied in the holy Scriptures, which they do not understand aright, nor with such spiritual sense as the Church knows them, but take them in an earthly and carnal manner"; and 2.23: God promised them "the chief felicity, which pertains unto souls".
2. Dialogus de Utr. Nat., pp 131ff, where Martyr rejects the Lutheran distinction in modes of predication - personal, sacramental and ceremonial-typical - and identifies the latter two. Brentius wished rather to identify the first with the unio hypostatica, the second with a consubstantial presence in the bread and wine, and the third with the O.T. rites and figures.
3. in I Sam. 1.4, a most valuable section comparing the sacraments.
4. cf. in I Cor. 10.2: Illi venturum expectabant, nos venisse confitemur.

distinct is something done than expected". (1)

The second question is the deeper one, already noted by us. How could they have actually partaken of the same Christ before the Incarnation? For Martyr's position is emphatic:

Neither could the Jews of antiquity have life and the Spirit except through the flesh of Christ. (Def. 706)

This question is answered in two ways. A primary reference is given to the eternal significance of the Incarnation and Death of Christ, which God "regards from all eternity". (2)

Of what more force unto salvation is Christ's death now, as already past, than it was in the old age, when it was looked for as coming? Doubtless on each side, faith is required. (in Rom. 3.9)

The unity of grace and faith thus imply that

they received by faith the flesh and blood of Christ which were to be given for our salvation, and we by faith and spirit embrace them as already given. (Epitome 2.6)

This is Martyr's constant stress, that faith always means union with Christ, so that what is demonstrated to us was promised of old, but just as we eat what is already given to suffering and death for us, so also they ate by faith "what was to be crucified and dead". (3) The matter of the Sacraments is always the same - the meat and drink of their sacraments is one with our meat and drink. (4)

From this Martyr passes to a more positive historical correspondence with our Eucharist, in the Manna and in the Peace-offering. Manna is an obvious sacrament of the nourishment of Christ, which it shows "in enigma" and our Eucharist shows

-
1. in I Sam. 21.3. Martyr often quotes Augustine on this point: sacramenta nostra pauciora esse, faciliora, significantiora et magis augusta quam veterum fuerint.
 2. in Rom. 4.11.
 3. Dial. 133.
 4. Tract. 8.

"in image" (in specie). (1)

Manna rained down from heaven, which was not without miracle; in like manner Christ had the divine nature ... Manna nourished and was given abundantly: Christ also is our meat and sufficient to nourish many, yea even all ... (in I Cor. 10.3)

The sacrament was the same, as regards substance, of Manna among the old Fathers, as of the Eucharist in the New Testament.

(Prop. ex Exod. 16, nec. 10, 14)
Manna was an outward food, and could not give eternal life, but it had Christ joined with it. ←

The peace-offerings show a more striking likeness to the Eucharist, since in them the Hebrews "feasted and rejoiced together before the Lord". (2)

Because a participation of Christ was obtained in the eating of those things offered in sacrifices, therefore they were suitable for human consumption, just as are the symbols of the Lord's Supper ...

In the sacrifice of peace-offerings, the Holy Communion was exercised among the faithful; for there Christ was not only set forth to be believed, but was received. (Prop. ex Levit. 1, nec. 7; 2, nec. 5)

and that was the Holy Communion of those times, since in these victims the holy Fathers ate the body and blood of Christ, as we do today in the bread and wine of the Eucharist. For they not only fixed their eyes on the flesh set before them, but by faith beheld Christ, Who was going to assume flesh, that by His death the sins of the whole world might be expiated. (in I Sam. 1.4)

There are other likenesses to our Eucharist, the showbread and bread of Melchizedec, for instance, which the Early Fathers often compare. In this respect, Martyr declares that the showbread and bread of the sacrifices were two things: signs of the true body of Christ and the coming heavenly food, to be eaten spiritually by believers; and types of our Eucharist. (3) He also sees a kind of dispensation of the O.T. communion, since no flesh was eaten in the sacrifices before the Flood, but

after the Flood, they not only offered sacrifices but themselves ate of the sacrifices: which seemed to be a singular benefit of God, as though now He deigned to call them to His own table, and admit them to communion with Himself. (in I Sam. 9.13)

1. Def. 696.

2. in Iud. 16.31.

3. Def. 400.

In a significant passage of the Defensio, Martyr states that since Christ may rightly be termed the corpus of all preceding shadows and sacrifices, therefore the O.T. saints, seeing the signs but cleaving to the promise of His coming, spiritually feasted upon their Saviour and so ate His flesh. (1)

Thus we find in Peter Martyr's teaching a doctrine of Christ's presence in the pre-Incarnational age which preserves the sacramental-analogical nature of revelation, and which gives ultimate revelatory significance to the O.T. history.

In the oppression and deliverance of the godly which is read in the Old Testament, we have the death and resurrection of Christ, not in a figure but truly, since Christ truly suffers in His members.

(Oratio de Res. Christi)

these things which preceded were not only types and shadows of the Lord's death and resurrection, but in one way also had in them the very truth itself of those things. For since those holy men suffered many grievous things, and since in time help and deliverance came by God - inasmuch as they were members of Christ it follows that Christ both suffered and was delivered in them. Wherefore we say that the passion and resurrection of Christ began even from the first times, but afterwards took place more manifestly in Christ Himself, and yet became still more evident through the present death of the Church, which it daily abides in labours and sorrows, expecting the blessed resurrection of the flesh. (in I Cor. 15.3)

-
1. Manducatio carnis eius, quam veteres quoque habuerunt - Def. 65; cf p 58: bread and wine referred to the coming Redeemer, and so were symbola Christi to the old Fathers.

CHAPTER III : CHRIST AND THE NEW TESTAMENT SIGNA.The Divine-Human Person.

We are constrained to confess (as faith itself witnesses to us) that this Christ is none other than a unique person in whom the divine and human natures are joined in an indissoluble bond ... God and man in the person of Christ in perpetual society. (1)

The Child of Mary was assumed by "the merciful God, truly the word from eternity", who formed a union which was true and therefore eternal. The "blessed God and man Jesus Christ" became in the Incarnation the New Man, for "He was made to be such an one for our use and behalf" -

the Divine Word has cleansed our nature, by heaping divine gifts upon it. And this is not to be understood regarding that man which He assumed, but all those who in true faith are joined together with Him as His members.

Peter Martyr stresses, like Irenaeus, the "for us" - He cleansed our nature and clothed Himself with it, "to make us partakers of His divine nature". Christians have obtained in Christ "a participation of the divine nature", "their nature is made divine".

This divine movement of Incarnation involved no denial of the truth of either nature. In a sermon on Philippians 2, Peter Martyr discusses the familiar problem of the Two Natures. (2) The determinative factor is always the Divine nature:

(Paul) sets forth Christ for an example unto us ... Among men there is no fit example, it must be taken out of heaven. He that sees not the divinity of Christ sees nothing.

Thus although he speaks of Christ as setting aside (seponere) His majesty and glory for a while, this is not as if these are qualities which may be separated from the essence of God: "neither nature is changed into the other". Rather,

-
1. Catech. 5. Quotations in the first paragraph are from sections 5 and 10 - 12.
 2. Oratio de Morte Christi, L.C. 1038ff.

Christ is like a king who hides his majesty while he courts his beloved as a commoner in order to reveal his love:

First the power of the Word of God was manifested through His creation and providence, now is His love demonstrated.

The key thought is this hiding or veiling of the Divinity:

He did not put off (abdicare) divinity, He cannot deny Himself; and He Who is the cause that all things are, did not Himself cease to exist: but He hid Himself under a man, one most abject.

Yet He did "reveal in some way" (aliquo modo exereret) His divinity, so that the predestinate were able - aided by the signs given⁽¹⁾ - to grasp His divinity through His humanity. His humanity was like a veil (velum) which He put between - "As we see the sun when a cloud intervenes, so was He obscured".

Therefore "form" (μορφή or forma) is the term used for both, "as well servant as God", showing that neither nature is changed into the other. For "It is not the property of form to corrupt, but to preserve". In His obedience, Christ remained equal with the Father in regard to His divinity, and obeyed amicus amico.⁽²⁾ And yet we say,

The Lord of life submitted Himself unto death, and being immortal, died.

If this is taken as comprising His ^{on}humanity, then the Marcionites and transubstantiators will triumph, by saying 'He seemed to be man, but was not : it seems to be bread, but is not'.

How are the two natures related in Christ? Without confusion or separation:

Between this Scylla and Charybdis we must navigate carefully, that is: Unity of person is retained thus, so that the properties of the natures remain distinct, not mixed or confused. (Dial. 13A)

1. e.g. the Father's voice, the Angels, the Dove, the Sea's "becoming firm under His feet".
2. cf. in I Sam⁷ 7.24: in the Incarnation, the Trinity acts as a whole in respect of the actio, but the Son alone in respect of the opus. Thus Christ is "both efficient cause and effect". The works of the Trinity ad interna are singul-aria, those ad externa are indivisa.

Nestorius on the one hand and Eutyches on the other, these are the tempters to error in the doctrine of Christ. Peter Martyr's Dialogue Of The Two Natures in Christ is a Treatise on this very subject. There he works out the 'without separation and without confusion' (ἀχωρίστως, ἀσυγχύτως) of the Chalcedonian Christology, the "orthodox doctrine", in opposition to the Lutheran doctrine of the ubiquity of the Body of Christ.

Christ is one Person, but has two natures united in the same hypostasis with Himself: yet both of them complete and without violation in the properties ... You indeed think that the persons are torn asunder if divinity is established where the humanity is absent. This is by no means true: it suffices that deity, as immense and infinite, supports and substantiates the humanity in the hypostasis, wherever it may be ... Truly we make one hypostasis, and in that we unite two natures most compactly, but each of them in its own mode and extent. (Dial. 10A, 10F, 12D).

Martyr's debate with Brentius in the Dialogus is conducted according to the teaching of the relationship of analogy as outlined in Chapter 1 above. When Brentius (in the Dialogue, Pentachus!) demands that the unity of Christ means that humanity is to be found wherever deity is, Martyr objects that he is speaking of the two natures equivocally (ἐμωυνίδας, id est aequivocationis) so that they are confused in the manner of Eutychian doctrine; he must learn to preserve the proper ratio between them. For otherwise he will "annul the sacrament of the Incarnation".⁽¹⁾ And just here, in the definition sacramentum incarnationis, we reach the heart of Peter Martyr's sacramental theology.

The "hypostatic union" of the two natures in Christ means that they are neither separated nor confused, but related in a unique analogy, according to which the human nature is the ultimate Signum of revelation, the effectual medium of Divinity.

1. Dial. 12C

We do not perceive the divinity of Christ, except enveloped in flesh. Nor can our faith otherwise aspire to the divine nature, mercy, goodness and felicity, except through the humanity of Christ, which as a kind of intermediary (sequestra) is placed in the middle between us and God, since it is joined with the divinity ... For the humanity of Christ is like a kind of channel (canalis), through which not only sanctification, but also all the life-giving grace can flow from God to us ... For the Spirit and Word of God, that is the divine nature, is the efficient cause of our sanctification. But the medium through which He transfuses that sanctification to us, is the humanity of Christ. Therefore if we would speak rightly, the human nature is rather the instrument of the divinity, that is of the Word and Spirit. (Def. 590, 606, 609)

The flesh of Christ thus becomes the unique locus of revelation and the unique medium for communion with Him. (1) It is in this context that Martyr quotes Gelasius, that Jesus Christ is "the principal mystery" (mysterium principalis). It is on the basis of this doctrine of Christ as Himself the unique Mystery or Sacrament, the archetypal Analogue, that Peter Martyr develops his doctrine of the sacraments.

The Flesh of Christ in Incarnation and Eucharist.

The analogical relationship of the Sacrament to the Person of Christ was first developed and used in controversy by the Early Fathers. Gelasius and Theodoret (2) are the most explicit. Gelasius reasoned thus, against Eutyches: the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ is celebrated in the action of the mysteries; in this image, the substance of bread remains in its proper nature; therefore in the principal mystery the substance of the humanity of Christ must remain. (3) Theodoret stated, "Compare the image with the archetype, and you will

1. of Def. 60: the life-giving divinity of Christ is communicated through the humanity, so that we must eat His flesh by faith; in I Cor. 15.12: His divinity did not assume the humanity "to shut up His benefits within its bounds, but through it to derive the strength of His goodness" to all; Def. 294: on Cyril: the Word of God is not edible, "since we do not draw life from Him without some medium. But there is placed in between the human nature of Christ, which Cyril says is proper for eating ... by the spiritual eating of faith".

2. see App. C.

3. Contra Eut. (Def. 388, 585F, Disp. I.1, Tract. 31, etc). It will be obvious why Rome is somewhat embarrassed by this teaching of Pope Gelasius!

see the similitude". (1) Peter Martyr comments:

The Fathers proved there to be in Christ two perfect natures, through a simile taken from the Eucharist. Therefore we may argue thus: Just as two natures were in Christ not exchanged but distinct, so in the Eucharist are two natures, namely bread and the body of Christ, distinct but not confused by the conversion of one into the other ... such bread remains in the Eucharist, as human nature in Christ ... As the human is in Christ, so bread is in the Eucharist: But the human nature in Christ is whole and perfect: Therefore the nature of bread in the Eucharist is perfect. (Def. 386, 393, 395)

The hypostatic union does not divinize the humanity of Christ: the eucharistic bread is not converted into deity. The Fathers' analogy proved the nature of the relationship between the humanity and divinity of Christ from its image in the Eucharist; in the Sixteenth Century, when their Christology had been accepted but the Eucharist had become infected with the Eutychian heresy, Martyr reverses the analogy and proves, on the basis of the Chalcedonian Christology, two natures in the Eucharist, bread and the Body of Christ. For transubstantiation is essentially the error of Eutyches applied to the Eucharist. The two errors are complementary:

the heretics who deny the flesh of Christ, destroy the sacrament of the Eucharist. (in I Cor. 10.16)

you rob the bread of substance and despoil the body of Christ of quantity. (Disp. II. 2)

According to Peter Martyr, the true matter of the Eucharist is plain and easy, so long as we keep to three things: sense, Christ's humanity, and "the received definition of a sacrament". But because of the adversaries it has become "more intricate than any blind labyrinth". (2) Here again we see the implication of the analogy, or ratio sacramenti. Christ instituted the Sacrament so that all things should be done sacramentally: transubstantiation means adding something

1. Dialog. (Def. 389, 575-581, Tract. 29f).

2. Epit., Preaf.

more than the ratio of the sacrament requires. (1) Martyr explicitly acknowledges the Word of God as the constituting factor in "the analogy of this sacrament and the power of signifying", which the symbols do not have before consecration; yet on the basis of the Incarnate Word as archetype and the Holy Spirit as effective Agent, he is prepared to apply the concept of analogy in its rightful meaning. The relation of the bread and wine in the Eucharist to the Body and Blood of Christ will therefore be proportionaliter to the relation between divinity and humanity in the Person of Christ. That is, there will be likeness and difference

1. Tract. 21. of. Def. Obj. 15 on Berengarius; Obj. 20, 35. etc. and Part III below on the ratio. This central doctrine of Peter Martyr's teaching on the sacraments is borne out in striking manner by the original development of the Romanist doctrine of transubstantiation. It would seem that the doctrine had its conscious beginning in the 9th C. controversy between Radbertus and Ratramnus. The latter opposed Radbertus' theory of transubstantiation, on the grounds that the body of Christ is received in mysterio, in sacramento et spiritualiter and not in veritate, in specie et corporaliter. In the 11th C. Berengarius took up this doctrine of Ratramnus with such vigour that he was excommunicated by Leo IX. After imprisonment and threats, he accepted the form of recantation dictated by Cardinal Humbert in 1059, which he later refuted. It is this text of the Ego Berengarius which reveals the essence of the Romanist error; that bread and wine are "after consecration not only a sacrament but also the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and sensibly, not only in a sacrament but in truth are touched and broken with the hands of the priests, and crushed with the teeth of the faithful" (post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et sensualiter, non solum sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri). This is the doctrine given the official name of "transubstantiation" by the Fourth Lateran Council decree in 1215: Christ's "body and blood are truly contained under the appearance of bread and wine in the sacrament of the altar, being transubstantiated, the bread into the body, the wine into the blood" (corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem). cf. Cosin's 'Hist. of Popish Trans.'; Hebert's 'Hist. of Uninspired Teaching', II, p 136; Jean Cadier, op.cit. Ch. 4. The influence of Ratramnus on the Reformers is little realized - cf. A. Barclay, op.cit., Ch. 19). It is this "not only ... but also" which betrays the Romanist destruction of the sacramental analogy, and acceptance of the relation of identity in the Eucharist. The fundamental error is not simply a failure to use the doctrine of analogy in logical consistency, but a failure to begin with the proper analogy, the analogia Christi instead of the analogia entis.

of proportion. This is exactly what we find him teaching. There must be in the Eucharist a like relationship - but we must also

retain a certain variety in the mode and form of union. For the divine nature and the human are joined in Christ otherwise than the sign and the thing signified in the Eucharist. For in Christ those two natures are joined in one hypostasis. (Def. 388)

Yet not in all respects is the similitude and ratio the same, concerning the two natures joined in the same union in Christ, and the body of Christ signified by bread in the manner and ratio of a sacrament. But from that simile only this is received, namely that both natures ought to remain whole and sound. (in I Cor. 11.24)

it is not stated that out of the Body of Christ and the nature of bread, one subject (suppositus) is made, as of the divine nature and the human nature in Christ. (Tract. 42)

Martyr's analogy is clear: the Son of God joined Himself to humanity by the Incarnation in one hypostasis, yet without separation or confusion of either nature. In this gracious accommodation to man's need, God has constituted a certain form of relatedness with His creatures. The incarnational form is not to be repeated, as if the Son were to form further hypostases with His creatures, but it is to be reproduced proportionately to its nature. Thus in the Eucharistic relation between bread and the body of Christ, Peter Martyr declares the difference of proportion to lie in the unique hypostasis of the two natures in Christ, while the likeness of proportion lies in the "without confusion and without separation" of the two natures. Indeed, his analogical reasoning preserves the proportionality on all levels of Christ's relatedness to His creatures. The form of relation is "exceptional and unique",⁽¹⁾ but operates variously according to the nature of the creatures: the analogy between the union of Christ with us and with the signs, for instance, is "from the greater to the less by a negative" because His union with men is greater than with symbols.⁽²⁾

-
1. relatio eximia et singularis - Def. 642
 2. Tract. 53. For further analogical reasoning, cf. Def. 316 (Scripture "consists in sign and thing signified"), in Iud. 9.25 (the Holy Spirit and human will in conversion), in I Cor. 3.3. (the Spirit and the ministers of the Church).

We may sum up this introductory analysis of Martyr's sacramental doctrine as follows. A sacrament is a particular form of relatedness of two disparate terms, namely the relation of analogy.

In all sacraments there should be an analogy or proportion observed and retained between the sacrament and the matter of the sacrament, which analogy Cicero called a convenience. (Disp. II, first speech)

Therefore the mysterium in the sacramental relation is not so much what the elements are as what they signify⁽¹⁾ - and the signification in every sacrament is the Person of Christ, "total Christ", the Divine-human Lord.

The Communication of the Properties.

In this teaching about the sacramental analogy, Peter Martyr is well aware of the deep problem posed not only by the "excessive speech of the Fathers" but by Scripture itself:

But we ought to know that things by nature called disjunctives are yet by the institution of God so conjoined that both names and properties communicate with the other. For what could be more distant than the divine nature and the human? ... Yet on account of the communication of properties Christ says that (the human) is truly in heaven at the same time. Thus in sacraments there is, by the institution of God, a like union between the symbols and the thing signified ... But it is such a relation that what properly agrees with the things is attributed to the symbols, and what agrees with the symbols is in turn attributed to the things. (in I. Sam. 26.19)

Martyr acknowledges a certain kind of communication of the properties (communicatio idiomatum) which attends the analogical relationship. He had worked this out in his Commentary on Aristotle's doctrine of analogy as follows:

the same name is imparted to many, and the same ratio agrees with them, but through one is communicated to the other. Nor do all things called equal in name participate straightway in definition, but the nature signified by definition is of one of them properly, but through this falls and passes to the other ... And this is what Aristotle says in this way, that the first and the last are in them, since they are analogues of various numbers among themselves, but not in reality univocal. (in Arist. Eth. p 136)

1. Def. 31.

Analogy brings with it a sharing of the names, so that the relation appears to be univocity instead of analogy. When this seeming identity of the term is referred to a real communication and therefore a real conjunction, heresy works itself out from the nominal communication to posit a real communication. For as Theodoret said, "this is what causes the heretics to err, the conjunction of names".⁽¹⁾

You assert a communication between the properties not verbally but even of the thing itself! (Dial. 131)

Peter Martyr accepts this problem as a serious one - does not Scripture say that the Son of God suffered, and that the Risen Man is glorified?⁽²⁾ In respect of the divine nature, Martyr points out that this is a case of the impropriety of our theological language: the Lord of glory "is said to be" crucified, although properly speaking, passion does not pertain to the Word. In respect of the human nature, only those properties are communicated (in reality) "of which human nature is capable", so that immensity and ubiquity, for example, cannot be communicated in reality, only in name, by what Martyr terms the verbalis communicatio. For to grant a real communication of all the properties "would dissolve the hypostatic union".⁽³⁾

We grant that the things universally spoken of Christ are sometimes to be understood of the one nature and sometimes of the other: yet Christ Himself is but one person and substance. So we say, the immortal God was born, crucified and dead. For there is a certain communicating of the properties by the wonderful connection of the two natures, which Nestorius attempted to separate. (in Rom. 9.5)

The details of this problem will concern us in Part III, but here we must

-
1. Et hoc est quod facit errare haereticos, nomen coniunctio - quoted in Dial. 42B; again, unio facit nomina communia. (33E)
 2. Dial. 30 - cf. the whole of Loc. II, De Proprietate Naturarum in Christo; pp 30ff deal explicitly with the comm. idiom.
 3. Ibid., 42F

understand Martyr's insistence upon the wholeness of Christ even while maintaining that the "attribution of properties" must be closely examined to see "of which nature it is spoken". (1)

The Person of Christ, although having two natures, yet is one.
(De Poenit. 32)

Wherever the Son of God is, it is undoubtedly He that has joined with Him the human nature; though not so that He makes it present in actual fact wherever He is, since for its own truth it is necessary that it should be bound within its own limits, and be contained in a certain place.
(in I Cor. 15.47)

If we understand the "whole Christ" in a "personal" manner, we acknowledge His omnipresence. Therefore just as the divine nature made room for the sufferings of the human "by a kind of dispensation of grace for our salvation", (2) so also the human nature, in respect of the hypostasis, characterizes eternally the Son of God, so that He is always the Word made flesh, even though that risen Body is "located" at the right hand of the Father:

For wherever the Word is, He has always joined with Him the human nature; and if that is not always in as many places, yet He has it coexisting with Him. Therefore we may say, the Word of God, Who is everywhere, is that Word that has conjoined the human nature in the same hypostasis, and as a true man should, this is finite and kept in heaven, and as Peter says, will be retained there until the last day.
(Def. 295)

Thus Peter Martyr outlines a Christology which safeguards the truth of each nature, while maintaining the dynamic unity of the Person of Christ. And the nature of their relationship implies that "verbal communication" or sharing of the names, which analogy involves.

It is also to be observed that since the divine nature of Christ is present most truly to us, therefore through alternation and communication of the properties, the same can be said of His humanity.
(Def. 637 (II.10))

-
1. Disp. II.1. - Chedsey had affirmed a real comm. idiom.
 2. in I Sem. 13.32

This kind of communication of the name, Martyr calls a "trope"⁽¹⁾ or figure, namely metonymy.

But the trope we adduce is plain, and received by the Fathers, nor has it anything that opposes human nature or divine, nothing alien to the rule of faith, nothing that completely overturns the law of nature or to which miracles and portents are necessary ... The trope is metonymy, by which the sign assumes the name of the signification. (in I Cor. 11.24)

Elsewhere Martyr points out that although this is properly metonymy, it can also be synecdoche, taking the part for the whole,⁽²⁾ Further, in a significant passage he relates his use of these terms, metonymy and synecdoche, to the figure alloeosis which Oecolampadius and Zwingli had used.⁽³⁾ Gardiner had accused him of using this figure in the key proposition Hoc est corpus meum, and Martyr replies to the charge:

But I never said or wrote that anywhere. For in those words I always declared outright that I acknowledged Metonymy or Synecdoche. Yet not even there can alloeosis be denied, if one understands that figure thus, as I do. For the Sacrament of the Eucharist consists of two parts, wheat bread and the body of Christ. Wherefore when the name of the one is attributed to the other, and bread is called the body of Christ, there cannot be denied as manifest there a permutation or alloeosis of names and words. Nor is the use of these tropes Metonymy and Synecdoche much different, in my opinion, from Alloeosis and alternation. (Def. 598)

In this teaching upon the trope operative in the doctrines of Christ and sacrament we must keep in mind the constant presupposition, Martyr's doctrine of

-
1. tropos - a sect called by this name arose in the post-Nicaean period, so reducing the Christological relationship to a bare similitude (tropos and analogia had been synonyms, for Athanasius) that "tropism" came to imply a doctrine of mere symbolism, something like the "bare analogy" of Oecolampadius, or the Zwingli of the "middle period" and its continuance in Megander of Berne - cf. A. Barclay, op.cit., Ch. 6 for Zwingli's "Nestorianism".
 2. Def. 650.
 3. ἀλλοιωσις or Gegenweschel - Luther called this the "devil's mask"

analogy. The "bare analogy" associated with the word tropos in the minds of both Romanist and Lutheran opponents doubtless gave justification to their charge that tropism was a mere rhetorical device, concealing a doctrine of mere external symbolism in the Sacrament. That this was a travesty of Martyr's doctrine we shall attempt to show in Part III. In the present context we should realize that Martyr's concern is the opposite error, induced by the excessive phrases of the Fathers.

We must beware that we attribute not to the elements or symbols, considered apart from Christ, what is proper to Christ Himself; but when both Christ and the symbol are received together, the properties are there communicated. (Prop. ex Exod. 16, nec. 15)

If at any time the holy Scriptures seem to attribute forgiveness of sins or salvation to outward signs, that must be understood by the figure Metonymy, by which those things are given to signs which are proper to the things signified, and the things signified are expressed by the name of the signs. (De Templ. Ded. 18)

Moreover, it is St. Augustine himself that makes so much of this nominal communication: (1)

Sacraments (Augustine says) have a similitude to the things they signify, and bear their names. Whence Baptism can be called faith, because it is the sacrament of faith. And therefore baptized infants can be said to have faith, because they receive the Sacrament of faith. (in I Cor. 11.24)

Here is to be noted a phrase of speech much used in the holy Scriptures, by which what belongs to the matter is attributed to the instrument or sign. And that this is often used in the sacrament, we have many times proved by Augustine's opinion, although our adversaries are sore against this. (in Rom. 5.3)

¶ This dynamic view of the Person of Christ and the Sacrament's correspondence to Him leads inevitably to the centrality of the Death and Resurrection of Christ

1. Ep. ad Bonif.: Sacramenta habere similitudinem cum rebus quas significant, et nomina earum gestare.

in Christological doctrine, and therefore to a correspondent centrality in the doctrine of the Sacrament. This is because the Analogue is not an Object, nor even a passive Subject, but One Who acts in history. The relationship of the Two Natures in Christ is not a problem of logic, for this relationship is revealed to us according to a historical pattern. We are not faced with the problem of the possibility of Incarnation, but with the problem of the Incarnate Word.⁽¹⁾ The heart of the analogy is His Death and His Resurrection, and this images itself in the analogical action of the Sacrament as descent and ascent.

The Death of Christ.

The end of all Scripture is Christ crucified. (in I Cor. 1.23)

there is but one principal and excellent truth, to which all other truths are directed, namely that Christ the Son of God suffered for us, that by Him we might receive forgiveness of sins - what wonder is it if our faith have respect to this one thing chiefly? ... since He is the end of all Scripture, He is also the sum and principal object of our faith ... For the dignity of faith, like other faculties of its kind, is derived from its objects. (De Iustif. 71)

Peter Martyr's constant theme is the Death of Christ, for it can "never be praised or considered enough by us".⁽²⁾ Such a theme means that man's attitude to God will be primarily one of thankfulness, and this is precisely the keynote of Martyr's whole theology, especially his doctrine of the sacraments. His usual term for the Lord's Supper is simply Eucharist, that is, "thanksgiving".

Justly therefore may we rejoice, that by faith we are made partakers of so great a benefit, since Christ our Head took upon Himself all the rebukes and ignominies due for our sins, and utterly abolished them. (Catech. 15)

-
1. For a notable summary of this basic Reformed position, see W.W. Bryden, 'The Christian's Knowledge of God', pp 114ff regarding the Romanist doctrines of Revelation, Church and Mass. "The true Reformed Churchman finds that he must never transcend the incarnation-miracle from the human rational side" (p 116).
 2. Catech. 13.

Christ is the pascha through a trope ... By this sacrifice in times past the Israelites were released from their Egyptian bondage: but we through the death of Christ are rescued from hell, death, sin and the devil.
(in I Cor. 5.7)

He gave unto us His righteousness, and took upon Himself our sins.
(De Morte Christi)

It is this tremendous act of grace, the humility of God's descent even unto death and hell, which bends all his thinking to its own pattern. And just as the Trinity is involved in Creation and Incarnation, so also in the Death of Christ.

When we behold all these things, I beseech you let us with eyes of faith look into the most sacred breast of the Lord, and we shall see the incredible flame of charity, and inestimable fire of His love, by which the whole world might be kindled, if it were acknowledged with one word. As He made the world could He have redeemed us, but He would not, that we might understand His love ... Yet the will of His Son sprang from the will of the Father: in so loving us He obeyed His Father. Now we may be sure that the Father loves us: 'For He so loved us that He gave His only-begotten Son'. This is to be drawn to the Father by the Son ... In the death of the Son the Father's love shines upon us. (De Morte Christi)

Although Martyr acknowledges an objective need to "balance" the world's sin and guilt, yet he does not think of the Father as delivering the Son according to a forensic scheme of atonement.

God could have been content with any other thing. But His will was rather to have this: not to feed His eyes or mind on the afflictions and punishments of Christ ... He saw that by this means alone might His love towards us be most perfectly declared; and also to set forth an example of a most holy life for men to follow. (in Rom. 5.8)

The necessity in the death of Christ lies in the Divine providence and will, which chose this particular way in the freedom of grace; the fact that the Death was pleasing unto God is grounded similarly in the "unmeasurable charity and love" of the Father. The Son is "a pledge of God's love", indeed is the very God Himself, Who

vouchsafed to come Himself, and to suffer a most bitter death upon the Cross, (in Rom. 5.8)

Martyr notes the terrible shamefulness of the Cross and its intense suffering. Both are related to the Christian life, its consolation in humiliation and persecution.

The Cross of Christ makes all things acceptable, if it is grasped by faith. By it our sins are forgiven, our concupiscence broken and not imputed to us, the devil is vanquished, we are delivered from the law, from death and condemnation ... By it hell is conquered.

(De Morte Christi)

This severity in Christ's Death is also related to the justice of God, Who deals not lightly with the quality and quantity of human sin, and to the human conscience, for man could not rest elsewhere than in this Death of the Son - he could find no comfort "unless the severe sentence against Christ had preceded".⁽¹⁾

In this teaching, the Life of Christ is not regarded as irrelevant, for Martyr takes seriously the humanity of Jesus as the Christian's example.⁽²⁾ But his entire Life was shaped by the approaching Death as the ultimate moment in the movement of humility. Indeed, Martyr never separates Incarnation, Life, Death, Resurrection, Ascension and Return as discrete events externally related to one another. The Death and Resurrection may be called "the principal points of our religion", but this is because they sum up all the other events and circumstances.⁽³⁾ Thus he states explicitly that the Death of Christ gives an understanding of "all the mysteries of Christ" from Nativity to Cross and burial, just as His Resurrection sets forth the things that follow. It is therefore a false question

1. Catech. 17.

2. e.g. in I Sam. 11.13, Martyr speaks of the Gospel in the Law, judging that we should act with "gentleness of mind", applying the law with clemency, since Christ's dealing with the adulteress is an example of our own sin and repentance.

3. in I Cor. 15.3

to ask whether faith is directed to the Death or the Resurrection of Christ, although Martyr agrees with Augustine that faith "chiefly consists" in the Resurrection by which we are justified.⁽¹⁾ What is most important in this regard, and what allows their nominal separation, is the "elegant analogy and proportion" that obtains between Death and our faith, and the Resurrection and our justification. For as is the Death to our forgiveness of sins, so is the Resurrection to our new life. We too must die, that we may "enter upon a heavenly and fruitful life".⁽²⁾ This analogy determines Martyr's whole thought of the Christian life, and in particular, the Christian's use of the Lord's Supper.

The Resurrection of Christ.

Christ Who is our Head is raised from death, and we also are raised in Him. Tell me, I pray you, will you not judge him to have escaped the danger of death who, falling into a swift river, holds up his whole head above those deep and dangerous waters, even though the rest of his members are still drowned in them? (Catech. 25)

Because of his doctrine of justification as union with Christ, Peter Martyr is concerned to show at every phase of his Christology, the analogy for Christian experience and life. The analogy is significant, for example, in relation to the Virgin Birth, which is

-
1. in Rom. 4.25 - cf. in Rom. 10.9: "The resurrection of the Lord is a sort of knitting together and bond by which the preceding and following articles about the faith of our salvation are very well conjoined"; in I Cor. 15.1: the Resurrection "contains the sum of almost all our faith" and 15.13: "Faith concerns the resurrection most of all".
 2. Ibid. - cf. especially the Oratio de Resurrectione Christi for this theme (L.C. 1045).

not only to be understood of (Christ) ... but of all those that in true faith are joined together with Him as His members ... For just as He was begotten without human seed, so are we born again unto new life by the power of God's Spirit. (Catech. 11, 32.)

But it is focused primarily in the pattern of the Incarnate Christ as Death and Resurrection. The Christian's justification involves a reactive movement of descent and ascent. This reaches its climax and most fruitful expression in relation to the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, for only in the Resurrection may we perceive

the form of that spiritual life, in which we must live no longer to the flesh, but to the spirit ... In this stands the whole sum of Christian doctrine, that inwardly we should ever be renewed, and outwardly, as far as lies in us, we should please and benefit our neighbours; since Christ being raised from the dead, has so greatly endowed us with His benefits, by giving from that time the gift of His Holy Spirit unto His children ... Wherefore our part is to bend all our diligence and care to that end, that we may honour Him in a godly manner: not with earthly ceremonies or various human inventions, but with spiritual worshipping, and what may be agreeable to that heavenly and spiritual state to which Christ is now raised ... being raised with Christ, it is fitting that even as we behold Him in the place and degree in which He is set, so should we with uplifted eyes of our mind, fasten our hope upon Him. (Catech. 26)

This passage is striking in its clarity and implications - and comes from his earliest written work! The Christian is one united to Christ, to the dead and risen Lord. Like Christ, he experiences death and resurrection here and now. For him, therefore, the sovereignty of Death is broken, it lies in his past, even though he daily experiences - still under God's own Sovereignty! - its threats and its attacks:

He leads them to the gates of death and back again, taking care that in His adopted children may shine the image Whom He naturally begat to Himself before all eternity. For this first-begotten, our Brother Jesus Christ, first died before He should be raised by His own and His Father's power. Therefore it is fitting that we also who are appointed to be made like His image, should first die before we rise again. (Ad Rom. Angl. Ep; L.C. 1121.)

He is therefore one who is travelling away from death and towards resurrection

and life - and therefore away from deadly human works and sacrifice, from Mass to Eucharist.

But now, therefore, set free by the grace of God, we are joined to Christ through the Spirit, to Christ I say being raised from the dead; by this union we shall now bring forth fruit unto God, and no longer unto death and damnation. (De Iustif. 12)

Union with Christ according to the double movement of death and resurrection - here is Martyr's doctrine of Christian life. The Christian is set free to perform good works by the power of the Spirit, for the Holy Spirit is the bond of His union with Christ. Thus Martyr's prayers, for example, are full of the plea for the Spirit's illumination, that the Christian may delight in God's commandments, and have strength to fulfil them. (1) The Holy Spirit communicates to us the properties of the new humanity of the Risen Head: membership in Christ means partaking of His new manhood - Resurrection and Ascension mean Holy Spirit and new man.

The Ascension of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

just as Christ being raised from the dead ascended into heaven, so it is fitting that we, being justified by His grace, should in our whole life think no more upon earthly things, but upon heavenly ... Christ, departing into heaven, gratified us with that singular gift of the Spirit ... The godly live in Christ, and Christ in them, and that by His Spirit. (Catech. 26, 32, 34)

The death of Christ was the price of our redemption, yet it has no relevance for us apart from the movement of exaltation: Resurrection, Ascension, Intercession and Return. (2) But these are related strictly to the office of the Holy Spirit, Who comes to us as the chief "effect" of that movement. (3) He is the

1. Preces. esp. on Psalm 119. cf. in Rom. 5.20: After justification "the law does not lie idle but is like a mirror" showing Christian fruit, profit and need.
2. This paragraph is based upon the Catechism, third Article.
3. cf. in Rom. 4.25: The Spirit was required to apply Christ's Death unto us, "and to give us this Holy Spirit, Christ rose from death"; Dial. 69D: Christ's Ascension is for the purpose of being glorified, sending the Holy Spirit, and interceding for us.

secret of our new life, and is unto us as the soul is to the body. His chief office is that of teaching, by which "He works a wonderful transformation" (mira transformatio) in the minds of the elect. Our affections, even the members of our body as well as our mind, become instruments of the Spirit.

In a deep sense this teaching on the Ascension and the Holy Spirit is the crux of Peter Martyr's theology. He passionately returns to this article again and again in debate, because it so perfectly expresses the nature of faith: a being lifted up by the Spirit to sit in the heavenly places with Christ. So these two elements, the "placing" of the Body of Christ and the office of the Holy Spirit, are the poles about which his sacramental teaching moves. This may be illustrated with reference to two significant themes of his, the continuing humanity of Christ, and the teaching of Christ in John 6.

The Holy Spirit operative within us joins us truly to the Person of Christ and so guarantees that we shall "one day come unto the state of Christ".⁽¹⁾ Just as we already are "spiritual men", according to Paul, so shall we one day have spiritual bodies. Yet these will not "become spirit" but will be spiritual because they wholly serve spirit: "without doubt the truth and property of human nature will still remain". This emphasis upon the continuing humanity in resurrection is a constant one in Martyr's thought,⁽²⁾ and is bound up with his teaching upon the body as part of God's good creation as well as his stress upon the eternal unity of the Person of Christ. Christ maintains the unity of His Person - Peter Martyr claims that his doctrine preserves this truth, by the very fact that it insists on the retention of the risen body of Christ in heaven,

-
1. This teaching is from the Dial., Loc. IV (De Christi Ascensione in coelum) and V (De Corporis Christi Loco in Coelo)
 2. cf. esp. De Resurrectione.

despite the charge of his opponents (Romanist and Lutheran) that their doctrine of a corporeal presence in the Eucharist, coextensive with His divinity, is the only means of preserving it. But according to Martyr, this is to deny the truth of His humanity and open a window to Docetism. In Chapter 8 we shall discuss this teaching in detail, and attempt to prove that Martyr's insistence upon the locus of Christ's Body does not deny a true communication of His Person, but rather is the only way of expressing the dynamic nature of the communication of Christ by virtue of His risen humanity and the power of His Spirit.

Martyr's teaching on John 6 is worthy of note in this regard. Like Zwingli, John 6 and I Corinthians 10 had special relevance for his doctrine of the sacraments. The Ascension means two things: the continuing humanity of Jesus Christ, and the office of the Holy Spirit. The former implication of the doctrine of the Ascension means that Christ in respect of His bodily presence is removed from the world of men. ⁽¹⁾ A corporeal presence in this age of the Spirit means the inventing of a kind of "third advent". ⁽²⁾ Jesus Himself teaches this clearly in dealing with the Capernaïtes. They sought to take His flesh by force, to rest in a corporeal communication. So He introduced the subject of His Ascension, to raise their minds from such carnal ideas to the heavenly reality and therefore the spiritual nature of His communication. Why did Christ mention His Ascension? Martyr asks -

Was it not to let us understand that He must not be eaten carnally? ... Truly it should have been to no purpose to have mentioned His Ascension, unless He meant to note that He spoke of that kind of eating which the absence of something corporeal should not hinder. (Disp. II.1)

Christ plainly teaches that He understands a spiritual eating, when He sets before them His Ascension into heaven. For thereby He showed that

-
1. Corpus Christi sic coelo contineri ut non amplius in terris versetur (Dial. 73A)
The bodily Ascension destroys the figmenta ubiquitatis, for ubiquity means frustra visibiliter ascendebat (Dial. 86F)
 2. Disp. IV, conf. of Q 2, no. 4; Def. 24, 31, etc.

He meant an eating in which we may eat by faith a thing absent in place and substance. And just as He recalled Nicodemus from an outward and corporeal generation to a spiritual, which we obtain in the soul and inward man, and raised up the woman of Samaria from the corporeal and outward water to the drink by which our souls are refreshed, I mean by the Holy Spirit: so Christ taught the Capernaïtes who now thought that His flesh should be eaten outwardly and carnally, I say He taught them that eating which we receive in the soul and embrace with faith.
(Disp. IV, conf. of Q 2, no. 2)

Thus the teaching of John 6 is related directly to the very matter (res ipsa) of the Sacrament. (1) Since Christ's words were spoken before the historical institution of the Supper, He could teach plainly and simply that spiritual man-education proper to faith. Therefore -

In the sixth Chapter of John is taught the manner of eating (modus manducationis).

Later the symbols were added, that we might be the more excited to the spiritual eating already taught. (2) Christ had already taught an eating of His flesh outside the sacrament (extra Sacramentum), by a direct reference to the office of the Holy Spirit (verse 63) springing from the mention of the Ascension (verse 62).

For when Christ said, 'I am the bread of life', He immediately added, 'Who comes to Me will not hunger, and who believes in Me will never thirst'. Most certainly He shows what He said later, 'The flesh profits nothing' - namely this, if eaten by the mouth, as you think - 'it is the Spirit that quickens', and 'the words that I speak to you are spirit and life'. They should be stones, not men, who deny that this pertains to the manner of eating.

Martyr's teaching relates the flesh of Christ as a continuing humanity retained in heaven until its advent at the Parousia, and the present office of the Holy Spirit.

1. The teaching in this paragraph is based upon Def. 156f.
2. cf. Tract. 78: "Nor must we in like manner judge that there is a difference between the spiritual eating of John 6 and that which the Lord instituted in the Last Supper, except that to that doctrine and promise which He had first taught, He added a seal".

Our argument is clear and open: if Christ is present with us wholly in the human and divine nature, there was no need of proposing the Holy Spirit as substitute ... Christ, absent in body, sends to His Apostles His vicarious Spirit, and is Himself present with them in virtue, grace and heavenly vigour, spiritually. (Def. 25f)

The Holy Spirit is the Vicar of Christ, and by definition excludes a corporeal presence of the humanity of Christ upon earth during this age in between the Advents of Christ. For that humanity is a glorified humanity: its substantial presence upon this sinful earth must necessitate judgment and change, and cannot be replaced by a corporeal presence in the Eucharist. (1)

The time of the humility and demission of Christ is past. (Def., Obj. 144)

This is unheard of by Theologians, that after His ascension to heaven, the Lord returns here in the humility of a servant ... For how, I pray you, does He sit at the right hand of the Father in glory if He still comes here in humility? To sit in glory is to remain there, but not to sink back again to a humble servant. (Def. 167f)

The Second Advent of Christ.

The truth of our communion is in heaven; while on earth we have but the image, (2) which the Holy Spirit uses as an instrument to stir up and confirm our faith, that we might be lifted up to this heavenly place and commune with our Risen Lord. (3) This movement of faith corresponds to the two Advents of Christ:

1. Def., Obj. 9; cf. Objs. 1, 38, etc. The corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist is a confusion not only of places (heaven and earth) but of times, before and after the Ascension (Obj. 36-37); cf. Boitome 2.1, Sent. 4, etc.: Christ is ascended as to His human nature, absent until He comes to judge: Tract. 20. The time of Christ's humility is over, yet they "draw Him down again, communicated in respect of His body to our jaws and stomachs"; etc. Like the other Reformers, Peter Martyr did not work out this aspect of his Eschatology in detail - partly, no doubt, in reaction to the sectarian revival of chiliastic teaching. But that he is conscious of the implication of Christ's new humanity for "the change of all things", his Commentaries show, especially on Romans 8 and I Corinthians 15.
2. Martyr often quotes Ambrose' distinction of umbra (O.T. sacraments), imago (ours) and veritas (in heaven) - rerum veritas est in coelis: quam si velimus intueri eo ascendamus oportet - e.g. Def. 11.
3. e.g. Tract. 50: "we must not stay in the signs, but must worship in spirit and truth Christ sitting in heaven at the right hand of His Father".

the presence of Christ in the Church agrees with their ratio. This is a familiar idea in Pater Martyr's thought, based upon his grasp of the movement of grace as humility and exaltation and the correspondence of faith to that. (1)

Scripture records no more than two advents of Christ. The first is a humble form to redeem us, the other glorious, when He shall come for judgment. But every day you invent infinite advents. For wherever there is a saying of Mass, or where the faithful communicate, you decree that the body of Christ is really and substantially present; yet to this you grant neither a humble nor a glorious form, but according to a kind of middle way you tie it to sacramental signs, of which neither does Scripture speak, nor do you bring any effectual reason. (Disp. IV, conf. of Q 2, no. 5)

We say that the holy Scriptures mention only two advents of Christ: you posit a third ... You cannot deny that this fictitious advent is not altogether of the same ratio with the first and last. (Def. 24)

Along with this insistence upon the glorification of Christ and presence by the Spirit until the revelation of that glory, Peter Martyr places the analogical significance for Christian life. Our summa foelicitas is not grasped in the Eucharist, but in the Resurrection:

We are saved by hope, not by the reality. (Def. 229)

But the signs and symbols that the Fathers used were changed by the coming of Christ, at whose second coming also, those that we now use shall likewise be removed. For when once we have the fruition of that chief felicity which we await, we shall then need no sacraments. (in Rom. 4.11)

While we live here, the sacrament sustains us not by removing Christ from His sphere of glory, but us from our sphere of humiliation. By the power of faith and hope (2) we now share this coming glory.

-
1. e.g., Def. 31: daily advents and ascensions in the Mass destroy the ratio; indeed, the demand for a corporeal presence is the demand for a second advent, so that transubstantiation consciously replaces the coming judgment and glory.
 2. e.g. in Rom. 4.5: "Chrysostom calls (hope) a golden chain let down from heaven, which chain if we take hold will draw us up to heaven"; De Iustif. 4: faith has respect to things past, present and future so long as they are hidden; and 54: "For justification and life are so joined together that the one is often taken for the other. And indeed, justification is nothing else than eternal life inchoate in us".

Yet this felicity which Christ has and which we shall have hereafter, we meanwhile have by a kind of participation, while we live here.

(in Gen. 27.28)

we are said to have (salvation) already, because by faith and hope we enjoy it as if we held it at present ... we possess these things as begun, although not brought to perfection.

(in I Reg. 2.4, An Dei Mand.)

Of this participation and possession the Eucharist is both sign and instrument.

Its nourishment is the sustenance of our pilgrimage.

'Until He come': These words declare that continually while we live here, we need the administration of the Sacraments, which have no place after this life. (in I Cor. 11.26)

Manna was given by the way in the wilderness, and to us is Christ given in the Eucharist, while we make our way through this age, which agrees with the example of the desert. Manna ceased when they reached the promised land, and we in heaven shall have no need of sacraments. For Christ shall be before us, and we shall behold God as He is. (in I Cor. 10.3)

since we are not yet in the fatherland, nor see what is revealed face to face, but pilgrimage towards the Lord, do you wish us to be wholly freed from figures? We still have figures, which signify not indeed that Christ will come, but teach that He has come already, and adumbrate those good things which we expect to come hereafter, in the eternal fatherland and the eternal life ... When we have God and Christ Himself in person (coram), when He is as He really is and we see face to face - then signs and figures will altogether depart. (Def. 66)

CHAPTER IV : THE MYSTICAL BODY.

Whosoever therefore comes not into this fellowship can by no means partake of (remission of sins), since this is granted only to those who are by faith united to Christ, the Head of the Church. By this we may rightly conclude that it is a gift peculiar to those that are true members of this Body under Christ its Head. (Catech. 44)

And to define it, we say that it is a company of believers (coetum credentium), and of the regenerate, whom God gathers together in Christ, through the Word and Holy Spirit, and governs through the ministers by purity of doctrine, by the lawful use of the sacraments, and by discipline. (in I Cor. 1.2)

Peter Martyr's doctrine of the Church was born in the fires of persecution and struggle. On the one hand were the Romanists, claiming that the "Gospellers" were schismatics and heretics and no true Church: on the other were the Anabaptists, claiming that the Reform movement was essentially the eschatological coming of the Kingdom, and disdaining the Biblical principle of reforming the Church. Martyr himself is a classic example of the Reformation, which was essentially action and life. One of the hierarchy of the Roman system, attaining episcopal functions, gaining the esteem of scholars and admiration of the Italian people, he became refugee and combatant in the ecclesiastical and theological struggles of five countries. Through all these troubled times, his one basis for understanding the Church was the fact that Christ, having joined Himself to the elect by Spirit and grace, had made them bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh - and therefore similarly and equally members one of another.

and these members are so completely joined to the Head, that they are called flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones. (The Church) is the soul of Christ.

For all we, who are believers, have one father, who is God, and one brother, the first-begotten, who is Christ: wherefore we are knit together in the closest friendship. (in I Cor. 1.2, 12.31)

The Church represents a two-fold communio, one

inward and concerning God, unto Whom we are joined in spirit by faith, hope and charity and all virtues, together with all believers in Christ,

and the other outward, according to which we partake of the sacraments and the "conversation" of members of the Church. (1) This does not imply the doctrine of the Church invisible, but rather indicates as the formative principle of the doctrine of the Church, the "heavenly root" and sustaining efficacy of faith, namely the Holy Spirit. (2)

The Holy Spirit, in working this union with Christ which creates a Body upon earth, although not tied to Church activity, (3) normally uses the ministry of the Church in His calling man to faith and uniting him to Christ. The "problem" of the Church, therefore, is once again the problem of the relationship of Holy Spirit to signum, which in turn derives from the Christological analogy.

The ministers of the Church ... are but means and instruments which God uses ... But if you consider them as they are joined to God and as He is effectual in them, and as the action of the Holy Spirit is coupled (copulatur) with the action of the ministers, so that in a sense one is made of these two, that which belongs unto one is by the figure (tropo) synecdoche attributed unto the other. In this way are the ministers of the Church said to work those things we have declared. And that which we have set down regarding the Ministers, must also be judged of the Sacraments ...
(in I Cor. 3.3)

"In a sense one is made of these two" - this is the mystery of the Church, reflecting the mystery of God and man in Christ Himself. (4) In the Church too

-
1. in I Cor. 5, at end, Treatise De Excommunicatione.
 2. in I Cor. 2.5: "our faith, whose root is not on earth but in heaven"; worldly wisdom cannot "adventure to measure things divine suis rationibus"; and 1.20: "the whole power of the persuasion of these divine matters must be placed in the power of the Word and efficacy of the Spirit".
 3. such as the speaking of doctrine or laying on of hands - in I Cor. 3.3.
 4. The doctrine of analogy has deep significance here too: the Church is not that Mystery or even its direct proportion, for its "extension of the Incarnation" is strictly analogical to the Person of its Head.

we are confronted with a relationship basically sacramental, as we were in regard to knowledge of God: and more particularly here, because in the Church the significant "marks" concern the Word in its threefold impact upon the membership of Christ's body as doctrine, sacraments and discipline.

"We go unto the Catholic and Apostolic Church".

Besides the inward cleansing of the Holy Spirit, are required, as instrumental to it, the outward Word and Sacraments. (1) Since the external calling and the outward signs are the ordinary means of grace, "the faithful man, if possible, should be baptized", for example. The Church is not to be lightly esteemed, and for the Reformers it was a most serious step to depart from Rome. But this step they took on the basis that the true Church was to be distinguished by three notes:

the three marks of the Church which are wont to be shown by men of our side, namely doctrine, the right administration of the Sacraments, and the care of discipline.

On this basis, they declared themselves to be separating from what had become a false Church, and therefore:

we have not departed from the Church, but have rather returned to it ... Wherefore in going from the Romanists we have not forsaken the Church, but have fled an intolerable yoke, and a conspiracy against the evangelical doctrine ... We go unto the Catholic and Apostolic Church, because the Church from which we separate ourselves lacks both. For it is no longer Catholic, since it has transformed the universal Church into the Roman Church; and Apostolic it is not, since it differs so far from the doctrine and ordinances of the Apostles.

Peter Martyr's quarrel with Rome may be summed up in the phrase, "the Scriptures, and not the traditions of men". Again and again he insists that the Church cleanse itself by the light of the Word of God, for "faith hangs only on

1. The material in this paragraph is from the Treatise De Schismate, in I Reg. 12, at the end - a most valuable study in the reasons for separating from Rome.

the Word", not, as the Schoolmen say, on the Fathers and Councils as well. ⁽¹⁾
 This is the "positive" Reformation principle in action, and unlike Luther's
 "negative" principle, which sought only a cleansing of the Mass, it attacks the
 Mass as a product of human invention and therefore that which opposes the Divine
 institution of the Eucharist. Martyr does not regard the source of doctrine
 quantitatively - the notable example is his attack upon communion in one kind,
 with its history of five centuries' custom - but qualitatively:

And it ought to be taken for a rule, that whatever is repugnant to
 the word of God, has no power to prescribe. ⁽²⁾

That which alone can prescribe for the Church is the Word, and in relation to
 doctrine and the sacraments, this means especially the Scriptures. ⁽³⁾ To "pure
 doctrine and right administration of the sacraments" Martyr always adds discipline.
 Now Schlosser interprets this as a third sacrament, that of penance, ⁽⁴⁾ which

-
1. in Iud. 7.27: "faith must be constant and wholly void of error - which two things are not found in the fathers and the councils".
 2. in Iud. 11.12, where he treats of prescription as against custom.
 3. cf. Catech. 38: Christians "will never suffer themselves one jot to be led from that truth which the Spirit of God has revealed to us in the holy scriptures, but they will assure themselves of that worship alone which is lawful and acceptable unto God, which He has prescribed in those holy scriptures".
 4. op.cit., p 397: "Als äussere zeichen dieser Vergebung erkennt Martyr in dieser Schrift aussere den zwei Sacramenten, der Taufe und dem Abendmahl noch ein drittes, die Busse". He is here dealing with the Catechism, and comments p 398n - "Man sehe den Anhang zu seinem Leben, wo man finden wird, dass er diess späterhin zurücknahm". But in the Propositions from Genesis of 1543, Martyr had already stated: "Since brotherly correction and accusation (fraterna correctio et accusatio) is odious to the world and the flesh, therefore it must with greater diligence be retained in the Church ... We allow a confession of sins, made not only unto God, but unto men". (ex Cap. 37, nec 4, and ex Cap. 39, nec 16). But in treating explicitly of Sacraments (ex Cap. 8, 15, 16, 17 for instance) he does not mention such confession. cf in I Cor. 10.10: "Paul retains disciplina most diligently - which is nothing else than a faculty of the Church divinely permitted, by which the will and actions of the faithful are rendered conformable to the divine law: as far as this is by doctrine, warnings, correction and at length by penalties, and if there is need, by excommunication".

Martyr supposedly retained in his early years, after the manner of Luther. But in the Catechism itself, Martyr makes it clear that the Sacraments are visible words, their signs being water, bread and wine:

Unto which there ought to be adjoined brotherly correction, which in these times is so neglected, that no man will apply it, either to another's use, or will submit himself to it: such profit have we obtained in the school of Christ! (Catech. 42)

Moreover, in his later Treatise, De Poenitentia, ⁽¹⁾ he allows no uncertainty about the falsity of the Romanist doctrine of penance. His doctrine of discipline is grounded in the union with Christ according to which the Church is the mystical body of Christ its Head.

The Church's Head and Government.

Now then are we content with one head, namely Christ, the Holy Spirit being the guide, and holy Scripture being like the outward testimony of His will: the sure persuasion of this is sealed in our minds by the power of the Holy Spirit. (Catech. 40)

The doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ means that He is its Head, and to speak of an earthly Head as well is to create a two-headed monster! ⁽²⁾
There is a Divinely-ordained order of government in the Church, and the Bishop of Rome overthrows this by taking unto himself supremacy.

But you will say, that although the inner sense and motion of the Church are of Christ, yet may there be an outer head to rule ministers, and to keep all in their duty. But there may not be; nor is it at all lawful, to change the order appointed by God. For God wills that in the Church there should be an Aristocracy, that bishops should have the care of all these things, and should choose ministers, yet so that the suffrage of the people is not excluded. (An poss. in eccl.)

1. This forms the closing section, in II Samuel.
2. cf. Catech. 40, and in I Sam. 8, Treatise An possint in ecclesia esse duo capita, unum visibile, alterum invisibile.

Now although Martyr appears here, and in many places, to limit the actual government to Bishops, his normative principle is to interpret this aristocratia as follows:

If you consider Christ, it shall be called a Monarchy, for He is our king, who with His own blood has purchased the Church to himself. He is now gone into heaven, yet governs this kingdom of his, not indeed with visible presence, but by the Spirit and by the Word of holy scripture. And there are in the Church those that execute the office on His behalf: Bishops, Presbyters, Doctors, and others bearing rule - in relation to these it may properly be called an Aristocracy ... But because in the Church there are matters of very great weight and importance, referred to the people, as appears in the Acts of the Apostles, therefore it has a respect of politia. (De Excomm.)

Paul indeed mentions bishops and presbyters, but does not teach that they are diverse orders. (Def. 208)

This brief indication of Martyr's attitude towards Church government is enough to show that his twofold attack upon Rome - upon its Pope and upon its Mass - share this theological foundation, that Christ is the Head of the Church, its order and its worship have their law only in His ordering and gracious self-communicating: the gates of the Church do not lead to an area of Christian life beyond the "power of the Word and efficacy of the Spirit".

The Church and the Word.

The authority of the Church has no dominion over faith, as some wickedly think. The office of the Church is to preach, to admonish, to reprove, to testify, and to lay the holy scriptures before men's eyes: nor does it require to be believed further than it speaks the Word of God. (in Rom. 10.17)

The Church has no power over the Word, inasmuch as "the Church was called by the Word" and has authority only from the Word - "the power of believing comes of the Holy Spirit." (1) Thus Councils of the Church, of which Martyr makes much, must be subject to judgment, namely, that they have "framed their doctrine to the rule of the holy scriptures" -

1. vim credendi esse ab Spiritu sancto - in Rom. 3.22.

Such Councils ... must be heard which cleave unto the Word of God. For whatever commodity or discommodity the Church has, ought wholly to be ascribed to the regard or contempt for the Word of God.
(De Iustif. 44)

Not the Church, but the Word of God, is the "engine" (machinus) by which the heretics were conquered, Christ Himself is the real Actor in the Church, in her beginning and her continuance, her justification and her sanctification. It is His Holy Spirit that establishes the Church in being, ⁽¹⁾ but also bestows this afresh by the dynamic communication of Christ's properties to His members. Justification means an imputed righteousness, but sanctification means a real, "second righteousness" as Christ grows in us. ⁽²⁾

The doctrine of faith as union with Christ means that the Church is the Body of the Incarnate Word. It is related to the new humanity of its Head, and therefore to the intercession of the Risen Man. ⁽³⁾

our Church is a true house of God ... And this our Church has from Christ her spouse, Who communicates all that is His unto her: for He is the most true house of God ... He is to us the ark, the temple and house of God - yea, the mercy seat itself. ⁽⁴⁾

Christ as the living Word, operative through His risen humanity and its counterpart in the new righteousness of the Church, is the basis and power of the Church's ministry of Word and Sacrament.

-
1. e.g. Catech. 35: the article on the Holy Spirit is "the root or stem" from which the article on the Church "arises and buds forth as a most suitable branch".
 2. De Iustif. passim. e.g.: "Justification is derived to us from the death of Christ and the promises of God. Thus a beggar receives alms with a leprous, feeble and bloodstained hand: yet not because he has a hand thus feeble and leprous": cf. in Rom. 5.9: we are justified first "before God by imputation", second "because daily there is augmented in us a new righteousness which we obtain in holy living, by the increase of our strength which we have now received by the Holy Spirit".
 3. in Rom. 8.34, in I Cor. 13.13. The priesthood of Christ has two "moments", the Cross and the heavenly intercession; in the latter the Church participates. See Chapter 10 for details of this teaching.
 4. in ipsum propitiatorium: in Gen. 28.12; cf. in I Sam. 1.9: Christ is our vera arca, Whom Paul calls ἀναστήριον, hoc est, vel propitiatorem, vel propitiatorium, quo alludit ad Mosaicum propitiatorium, quod Arcae superponebatur.

the ministry of the Church renders service to God, and works with Him for our salvation ... the grace of God is not bound by necessity either to the ministry or to the sacraments or to the outward Word. But we are speaking of the usual means (de usitate ratione) by which God leads men to salvation. (in Rom. 5.21)

For this reason "there is need of the continual ministry" of the Church, that men might behold the promises of God, both with words and with their seals, "by sacraments, which are certain visible words". This Augustinian definition of the sacrament as verbum visibilis is Peter Martyr's favourite, and points to the determinative orientation of the sacrament: it is the Word made visible. Although he stresses the centrality of preaching in the Church, ⁽¹⁾ particularly in view of the appalling sermonic silence of the Romanism of his time, yet he constantly affirms the need for visibility in the Church's ministry of the Word. Since Martyr's analogical thinking begins with the Person of Christ, the origin of this stress upon the Word as clothed in flesh is obvious. For the visibility of the Word in the Church is analogical to the visible accommodation of the Word in Incarnation. Not only must the Word be "repeated again and again" because "our mind so weak is," ⁽²⁾ but:

on account of our infirmity, that spiritual and inward eating, though it be accomplished by the soul and spirit only, yet is assisted very much by the outward help of the senses: namely by the divine sermon and visible Sacraments. And therefore Christ joins to the inward eating the outward symbols and action of eating and drinking. And saints desire and long for that same action, so that through it the spiritual eating of the soul may be preserved more safely and increased more and more. (Def. 724)

-
1. e.g. in Rom. 10.17: nothing more nourishes, maintains or confirms faith than the reading and repeating of the Word; "To this end are holy assemblies gathered together, to hear God's word ... And they that think a lively and pure faith may continue in Churches without frequent preaching exceedingly err"; the Virgins' lamps (faith) soon go out unless ministered unto with oil (the Word), as Chrysostom says. cf. in Rom. 1.9: there is a "profitable dialogue" between God and man, the reading of His Word and praying unto Him.
 2. De Iustific. 61; cf. in Rom. 4.11: the visible signa are given because of our weakness.

The Invisible Word made Visible.

For He rules His Kingdom, which is the Church, by the Spirit and the Word, to which Word are to be reckoned also His Sacraments. (Def. 417)

All such as have Thee (O most mighty God) for their shepherd, lead their life exceeding happily, as those who always have food abundantly enough of Thy heavenly doctrine ... Thou canst refresh us if it please Thee, with a most exquisite and well furnished banquet of Thy sacred doctrine and blessed sacraments, and make us drink plentifully of the cup of Thy Holy Spirit and grace. (Preces. Ps. 23)

The keynote of the ministry of the Word is edification, according to Peter Martyr:

Nor are they compacted together in this society, but that they should edify one another. (Catech. 39)

But edification means "upbuilding" (aedificare) - growth or nurture. And this is precisely the effect of the Word of God, "the principal food of souls" and the "origin of the remission of sins".⁽¹⁾ These two facets of the activity of the Word are constantly affirmed, the growth of our union with Christ, and the daily necessity of the forgiveness of sins. There are

two means by which the remission of sins exists in the Church, according to the twofold way (duplex ratio) in which the Word of God is set forth to believers. (Catech. 45)

a "mystery" we distinguish into the Word of God and the Sacraments. (in I Cor. 4.1)

The Word and Sacraments are the "nerves of the Church";⁽²⁾ to them the Holy Spirit joins His power of piercing to the inner man;⁽³⁾ what is spoken of the one applies equally to the other.⁽⁴⁾ Once again it is analogy which explains this best.

But concerning the sacraments, we have often taught in what way justification is to be attributed to them. For they have the same relation to it as the preaching of the Gospel and the promise about Christ offered to us, to salvation. (De Iustific. 87)

-
1. Catech. 39, 44.
 2. in I Cor. 11.20.
 3. in Iud. 19, De Magist.
 4. in I Cor. 4.2.

As the sense of the words of God, through the power of signification joined to the holy Scriptures, draws the thing itself to our souls, so the body and blood of the Lord are signified by the symbols, but are joined to our souls spiritually. (in I Cor. 11.24)

But the signification nothing differs, whether it is referred to sight or to hearing. Nor are the Sacraments other than seals of the words of God, the promises which are contained in them being added. (Def. 549)

And the Holy Spirit uses the sacraments to give us Christ spiritually, to be embraced by the soul and faith: just as we are said to receive salvation by the words of God; not that salvation lies hidden in those words, or stands in a real presence, but is contained by signification. And this comparison with divine words is very agreeable to the sacraments, since by Augustine's judgment they are visible words. (Disp. IV, vs Ched.)

The Word itself is sacramental, because it is the Spirit's analogy of Christ, the Word made flesh. Therefore Martyr argues from the nature of the Word preached and the Word written, ⁽¹⁾ and proves the analogical nature of sacraments, and also the effectual power of their signification - thus guarding against the two opposite errors of simple identity or simple difference.

the sacraments ... are visible words of this absolution. For just as the word sounds and is heard in the voice, so in a visible and evident sign a sacrament speaks and admonishes us; as we have faith towards it, we indeed obtain what it promises and signifies. Not do we otherwise have faith in its signification, than by the motion of the same Spirit of Christ ... do not think that sins are forgiven by virtue of the work wrought (operis operate virtute), by our receiving the Sacrament: since this we obtain by faith, believing what it visibly teaches us by the institution of Christ: so that the Sacrament is counted just as is the Word of God. (Catech. 45)

no more is to be attributed to the sacraments regarding salvation, than to the Word of God. (in Rom. 4.11)

We make the words of God and the Sacraments equal. (Def. 618)

This analogy to the Word is most fruitful in Martyr's teaching. For example, he demands the very same preparation before hearing the Word of God as before

1. e.g. in Rom. 1.16; 3.4; 4.11; Def. 290 ("Both apply the ministry of the body, the mouth in communion, the ears in the address. And just as through the ears reconciliation with God, eternal life, and the forgiveness of sins come not realiter, so in our mouth the true body and the true blood of Christ are not received proprie"), 316, 334, 387.

receiving the Sacrament. (1) Or again, the apprehension of Christ through the Word is of the whole Christ, with no problem of corporeal presence or of the "parts" which the scholastic doctrine of concomitancy sought to solve. (2) We eat Christ's flesh and drink His blood in the one as in the other - "as in the Word, so in the Sacrament". (3) And to the Christian -

Since they were instituted by Christ, the symbols are no less sweet than the words of God. (Def. 326)

Yet the chief question remains: what profit has the Sacrament over the Word? We have already mentioned the relation of the visibility of the Word to human infirmity; now we must relate it to the believer's union with Christ. For this union grows, it is augmented by the Holy Spirit, Who actually "transmutes" us into the bread and body of Jesus Christ, in Paul's language.

in receiving the Sacraments we are changed and converted into the body of Christ. (in I Cor. 10.17)

Although there are, Martyr teaches, two ways of receiving - that is, of being united to - the Body of Christ, "through the sacrament and without the sacrament", yet through the sacrament,

We have a kind of fruit of the Holy Spirit which by that private Communion we meanwhile grasp not so fully. (Def. 190)

The sacraments are seals which are not sufficient by themselves, but by the Holy Spirit's use of them as His instruments, serve positively to strengthen and confirm faith. (4)

If you ask, what commodity the sacraments bring to us, since we have remission of sins, and have by faith obtained righteousness, we answer 'very much': for they offer themselves before our eyes, and so

-
1. in Iud. 13.1 - this implication of the analogy is equally applicable today! cf. his Adhortatio ad coenam Domini mysticam: "Admit that God asks you: Why can't you? What do you answer, pray? 'I am defiled with sins'? Why not repent? Unto repentance a long space of time is not needful!"
 2. in I Cor. 15.47, An Christ. ex Coel.
 3. Def. 446.
 4. In Iud. 6.40

admonish us. For our faith is stirred up, not indeed by them, but by the power of the Holy Spirit, Who uses this instrument of the Sacraments just as He uses the instrument of the Word preached. And faith, being stirred up, embraces more and more both righteousness and the remission of sins. For these things are not in atoms but have some breadth. (in Rom. 4.11)

In relation to the Word of God, therefore, the Sacraments are that Word spoken over again, but this time related to a visible sign. In the Sacraments Christ clothes His Word of grace in fleshly elements.

The sacraments also are believed, but they are nothing else than visible words of God, to which is also joined the Word of God - as Augustine said, 'The Word comes to the elements and it is made a sacrament'. (in Rom. 10.17)

As the Word over again in a visible way, the Sacrament is a seal to the invisible Word of the forgiveness of sins:

It may seem sufficient to take that definition which Paul uses here, namely to say that the sacraments are σφραγίδες, that is, seals of the righteousness of faith. For they seal the promises by which, if faith is joined to them, we are justified... The head and sum of their signification we place in this, that they seal unto us the gifts and promises of God. (in Rom. 4.11)

This complex teaching about the effects of the Sacraments will concern us in the next two Chapters. Here we should note what is perhaps the most important fact in the relationship of Sacrament to Word: it is the Word that sacramentalizes. Martyr uses again and again Augustine's 'The Word comes to the element and it is made a Sacrament'. Strictly speaking, the elements do not profit, but only the Word added. (1) The sermo given over the element is that which finally profits, and that upon which the utility of the sacramental element depends. (2) In this latter context Martyr does give the element a "lesser utility" - but derivative from the Word. We do well to remember that for him, the Word

1. Tract. 57.

2. Def. 451.

means the active Christ, not a "five-word prayer"⁽¹⁾ with magic power, as the Romanist holds. For here, the work is "by Word and Spirit". It is not the "power and efficacy of the words" (of consecration) that make a sacrament, but the presence of the Holy Spirit.⁽²⁾ Indeed, Martyr declares that only one thing is absolutely necessary, "the invisible operation of the Holy Spirit".⁽³⁾

The Word of God is active in the Sacrament as the determinative factor.

Martyr distinguishes three parts to the Sacrament:

Three things are required in a sacrament: the promise, which is represented by words, the element by which the promise made is sealed, finally the command of God by which what is to be done is prescribed.
(in Rom. 6.5)

First comes the outward element, then the word of promise is added ... third is the commandment of the Lord, that it should be done thus. What concerns the element is received by the body, since it is an external thing; but the promise is received by the soul. The Word must come, that the element should have a signification to signify this.
(De Poenit. 13)

Martyr identifies this Word of promise with the signification, that is, the body and blood of Christ, so far as the Eucharist is concerned. Even apart from the Sacrament he can call the Word of Scripture "the body of Christ" and the "bread by which our minds are nourished", or can say with Origen, "The blood of the Lord is the Word of God".⁽⁴⁾ But more significantly, the Word in the Sacrament is the real signifying power:

Signs and outward actions of ceremonies are frail things: the Word of God endures forever, therefore the ratio of the Sacrament must be judged by that. So much is granted us, as God desires to give: concerning His will we know nothing except what His words (sermone) reveal to us. (An in Comm. Lic. 10)

-
1. Def. 114: Is bread expelled quinqueverbalis prece?
 2. Def. 785.
 3. in I Cor. 11.24.
 4. Epit., Sent. 13; Def. 451.

The Word of the Lord stands as a kind of medium between the symbols and the matter of the Sacrament, and also between us and the matter of the Sacrament, since it should be joined both to the symbols and to us. Both these conjunctions have regard to the Word of God ... And so the words of God make for a twofold union, namely to join the matter of the Sacrament to the elements through signification, but to our souls by the spiritual perception of faith. (in I Cor. 11.24)

Moreover, we receive the body and blood of Christ no less in the Word of God than in the sacrament ... for whatever fruit or grace the bread has in the sacrament, it has it by the Word ... the words both express and signify the nature of a sacrament more plainly, do the signs. ^{than} (Disp. IV, conf. of Q 2, no. 3)

This latter teaching upon the ultimate significance of the Word is a most helpful reminder of Peter Martyr's fundamental reference of all theology to the Person of Christ; for in Part III especially we shall see him struggling against adversaries in terms which often require such a reminder of the primacy of the Word. In this respect, too, we must develop the next part of this teaching: the number of the Sacraments. For in relation to the Word, a sacrament should be, formally, related to the eternal Word in His communication, and materially, related to a historical event of the Incarnate Word.

The Two Forms of the Visible Word of God.

If you give the name sacrament far and wide, for all those things which signify some holy thing ... you are compelled to posit not only seven, but infinite sacraments ... (we must) limit the name of sacrament to those things which not only signify spiritual things, but also are practised by certain words, and about which there is extant a precept so to do. (in I Cor. 7.10)

Peter Martyr strongly opposed any general idea of sacrament, from which one might derive the validity of a certain number (two, three or seven) of "special" sacraments - by beginning with the definition "the sign of a holy thing", for example. (1) Such a method implies infinite sacraments, and the actual number of

prescribed sacraments is relative to something external to the nature of a sacrament, such as a concern for the number seven, or for sevenfold "times" of human life.

Wherefore we treat not of a sacrament or mystery in general, by which is signified, as Chrysostom says, anything unknown and unspeakable, having in it much admiration, and above our judgment. For in this sense there is an infinite number of sacraments. For we may thus term sacraments, the nativity of Christ, His resurrection, the Gospel ... (in Rom. 4.9)

Peter Martyr rather approaches the sacraments according to their relation to the Word which sacramentalizes. The proper connotation of sacramentum is mysterium, as both the Hebrew and Greek originals testify. (1)

For who sees not that 'mystery' by the Greeks is the same as we call Sacrament? (Def. 163)

A Sacrament signifies a thing secret and hidden ... Let the heathen come, he will see water, bread and wine - what they are he will not perceive: the man of faith understands their reference. (De Poenit. 10)

This is the heart of Peter Martyr's doctrine: that sacrament is mystery; that the ratio of mystery is signification; that the signification is Christ Himself. For example, in treating of I Corinthians 2.7, loquimur sapientiam Dei in mysterio, he introduces Chrysostom's distinction of three modes or ratios of "mystery": (2)

1. in Rom. 4.11: "The word that signifies a sacrament is in Hebrew Sod and Razi. The first of these is common to all secret and hidden things, and more in use. And the other Isaiah used in the 24th Chapter when he said Razi-li, Razi-li, that is 'A secret to me, a secret to me'. Daniel also in his 2nd Chapter, dealing with the knowledge of the mystery, uses the same word. Such is the nature and condition of sacraments, that they contain hidden things, known indeed to some but not to all. And from this etymology the Greek word μυστήριον does not much differ, which is derived from κλειν and ειν μυστα ειν ειν ειν, that is 'close things ought to be kept shut within'. Such were the mysteries of Eleusis ...". The references are to Isaiah 24.16 and Daniel 2.18ff, κλειν.
2. Comm. ad. loc.; cf. in 2.10: the Holy Spirit alone reveals the mystery to us, using the sermone Dei for this purpose.

sacrament, when we attend to something signified by what is visible; paradox, as in I Cor. 15.51, Rom. 11.25, and Is. 24.16; and thirdly -

one part is known, but another part is unknown, in which kind the wisdom of Christians is placed: since indeed we now see through a glass and in enigma: but then - in heaven, I mean - face to face ... Also we can interpret Christ Himself as called wisdom in a mystery, since He held His divine nature concealed in part under the abject form of a servant.

This is the ultimate and normative meaning or ratio of "mystery": the Word made flesh. The sacramental mystery must be analogical to that ratio, and therefore Peter Martyr's principle is, the mode of mystery is signification.⁽¹⁾ Chrysostom's dictum is most fitting: 'In the sacraments we see one thing, believe another; behold with our sense one thing, understand with our mind another'.

A sacrament is a visible form, or a visible sign of invisible grace. And that is called a sign which, besides the form it offers to the senses, brings some other thing to our knowledge. (in Rom. 4.11)

two things ... an outward sign and a thing signified. (De Pœnit. 12)

The sursum corda is therefore the key to the action of the sacrament:

when Baptism or the Lord's Supper is administered, we should lead our mind away from water, from bread and wine, through faith unto Christ Himself, Who is communicated to us. Wherefore in the Church it is not by chance that rule obtains, before we come to the mystery, of calling out Sursum corda, that is as if to say 'Let your souls cling not to these things that are seen, but to those which are promised' ... Thus on earth are both men who teach and sacraments by which they teach: but the matter itself is a real presence contained in heaven; on earth it can truly be said to be through signification, the apprehension of faith, and the power of the Spirit and grace. (Def. 9)

It is this reference to the Word made flesh as the signification or true Mystery apprehended in sacraments that determines their nature and number. For the sacramentum reminds us that God has bound Himself to us in a covenant, by specific promises, that is, by Jesus Christ; therefore sacraments cannot be

1. Modus mysterii est significatio. Def. 163.

general but must be signs given by God's will and institution. (1)

it is not in men's power to ordain sacraments: they are testimonies of the will of God, and like seals; and it is not of man to counterfeits seals ... sacraments pertain to the ratio of faith. (De Poenit. 11)

God alone can will to signify and to seal His grace (our union with Christ) by earthly elements: for the ratio of faith is the givenness of the Word made flesh. Since the forgiveness of sins is the content of grace, we must

bind ourselves only to these two, namely Baptism and the Eucharist. (De Poenit. 12)

For only these two are related to the historical activity of the Word made flesh. The logic is simple: sacraments depend upon God's will, His will is revealed expressly in Scripture; Scripture shows that Christ instituted two Sacraments. (2)

Thus the "whole definition" of sacrament is this:

A Sacrament is a divine promise concerning the remission of sins through Christ, signified and sealed by an outward or visible symbol according to the divine institution, in order that faith should be raised up in us, and we should be more and more bound unto God. (De Poenit. 12)

The formal cause is the signifying and sealing; the material cause is the promise of God's remission of sins; the efficient cause is the divine institution; the final cause is the erection of faith, by which we are united to God. (3)

Sacraments are therefore not physically related to grace, as the Romanist scheme of salvation implies, which "turns grace into nature". (4) Rather are they the gracious accommodation of God's Word of forgiveness given visibility

1. in Rom. 4.11.

2. Ibid.

3. cf. in Rom. 4.11 as to the effects of the Sacraments: they instruct us in heavenly things; they kindle faith in us, to desire God's promises; they join us together in a closer bond of love "since we are all initiated with the same mysteries"; they separate us from sects; and they admonish us to live a holy life.

4. De Iustif. 24.

according to the inner ratio of that grace, the union with Christ as new birth and new life.

between the state of nature and of spirit there is found a most excellent analogy, since generation, life and nourishment are suitable to both. (in I Cor. 3.2)

This is the substance of God's Word, and Peter Martyr asks but one question about the Romanist sevenfold sacramental grace: "What Word of God is in these things?" For penance "represents no promise", nor has confirmation a divine institution; anointing with oil "has not the Word of God to warrant it".⁽¹⁾ Or again, if marriage be a sacrament, where will you stop? What about the washing of feet, embracing children in arms, and "almost every action of Christ", since these also are "signs of holy things"?⁽²⁾ Indeed, the washing of feet has the most reason to be called sacramental, since its element may have a signification more than common, and since a commandment was joined to it; yet

there are given no particular words, which should come to the element to make it a sacrament, and by which the promise of some singular gift of grace to be obtained is declared unto us. (An in comm. lic. 15)

Baptism and the Eucharist are the Sacraments of the Church, for they are given to Christ's flock as signs and seals of His twofold activity in and among them: of joining them to Himself in the union of faith, and nourishing them by the communication of His own new humanity. In the Christian life there are these two elements: the absolute element of once-for-all death and burial related to the Cross of Christ, and the ongoing growth in grace related to the Risen Man. The Sacraments signify and seal these two realities, that is, the Mystery of Christ Himself.

1. De Poenit. 14, 15.
2. in I Cor. 7.10

CHAPTER V : THE SACRAMENT OF REGENERATION.

Repentance and New Life.

There is one purgation set forth to us by faith, having repentance joined with it: by this are men purged and set at rest ... So God governs us by His Spirit and Word, and those who apprehend them by faith, repent ... repentance is the cross and gibbet of the old man.
(De Poenit. 1)

In the Treatise De Poenitentia, one of those gems of theological analysis casually placed in his Commentaries, (1) Peter Martyr deals with the basic problem of repentance and faith. The "fountainhead of repentance" is God's manifesting His goodness to us in Christ; when we apprehend this by faith, repentance follows. Now the "outward sign of taking upon us new life, is Baptism". What is the relation of repentance to Baptism? Is it the "second plank after shipwreck", as it had become as early as the Patristic period? Martyr is quite definite here: repentance is the change of life which Baptism signifies and seals: regeneration has negative and positive aspects, but the emphasis must fall upon the positive new life on which we enter.

If we relate this teaching to that of the Treatise De Iustificatione, (2) we see the profound doctrine of grace and faith implied. Faith has substance, a certain ontic content, namely union with Christ. The Word completes Himself in a real or substantial indwelling in believers. Martyr's chief definition of faith is simply "ingrafting into Christ", with frequent mention of Paul's Ephesians terminology. Moreover, this substance of faith is imperfect, incomplete, held only in the tension of God's promise. He further defines faith as

-
1. It forms the closing section of the Commentaries on I and II Samuel.
 2. in Rom., after Chapter 11.

"eternal life already begun (inchoata) in us". The inchoate nature of faith relates to the substantial union in terms of the Person of Christ as hidden because of His Ascension and awaited because of His Second Coming. To this twofold content of faith, a primary ingrafting into Christ and a pressing towards union with Him, Baptism and the Eucharist correspond. Their sacramental analogy both signifies and seals this content of faith to mind, soul and body.

Regeneration means a change "into Christ", and since His Work on our behalf is summed up in Death and Resurrection, Baptism, the sacrament of this regeneration, (1) may be "amply defined" as follows:

Baptism is a sign of regeneration into Christ, into His death, I say, and His resurrection, which succeeded in place of Circumcision, which consists in the laver of water in the Word, in which in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, remission of sins and outpouring of the Holy Spirit is offered, and by a visible sacrament we are grafted into Christ and into His Church and the right into the kingdom of heaven is sealed unto us, and we on our part profess that we will die unto sin and live hereafter in Christ.
(in Rom. 6.5)

Peter Martyr notes two analogies in the Baptismal rite. The chief analogy is the fundamental washing by which the cleansing power of God's grace is signified:

Water is the most fitting symbol of this. For just as the dirt of the body is by it washed away, so through this sacrament the soul is purified.
(in I Cor. 1.17)

the sign in sacraments should have an affinity and likeness with the thing signified by it. Wherefore since water washes away the filthiness of the body, makes the earth fruitful, and quenches thirst, it aptly signifies remission of sins and the Holy Spirit, by which good works are made plentiful, and grace which refreshes the anguish of mind. (2)

A second analogy is the specific form of this remission, death and resurrection, which has a more subjective reference:

-
1. sacramentum regenerationis was the Patristic definition; Martyr also puts Baptismus mysterium est Regenerationis (Def. 557)
 2. in Rom. 6.5; cf. An in Comm. Lic. 11; Def. 66.

Chrysostom notes that the similitude of death in this place admonishes us that what was done in Christ by nature is done in us by analogy. For it is not necessary that we through baptism should die by natural death, but that in our manners and life we should resemble the likeness of Christ's death. (in Rom. 6.5)

As Christ has drawn us by baptism into His death and burial, so has He drawn us out unto life. The dipping in water and coming forth again signifies this when we are baptised. (Orat. de Res. Christi)

This double analogy implies a simplicity about Baptism which Romanism has corrupted. Its "superstitions and inventions" have "horribly corrupted" Baptism:

oil, salt, spittle, wax, lights, breathings, exorcisms, consecration of the Fonts twice a year ... In vain also do they give precept of three times dipping in the water, since once may be enough, or else a little sprinkling. (De Templ. Ded. 5)

Yet in these external matters Baptism has not been so corrupted as has the Eucharist:

by God's mercy it has been somewhat less polluted with foul abuses. And although it is not used purely and soundly, yet there is less cause for you to complain of it. (Catech. 42)

The real sin against the Sacrament of Baptism is the doctrine of baptismal regeneration:

But the head of their superstition is this, that these men think sins are forgiven chiefly by outward baptism; but they are terribly deceived. This office is of Christ alone. (De Templ. Ded. 18)

On a deeper level, the analogy in Baptism means that this sacrament cannot be repeated. It signifies and seals our death and resurrection, our beginning of a new life; its whole power lies in its relation to the once-for-all character of Christ's Death and Resurrection.

Since circumcision was administered only once to each man, and since every man has but one nativity, therefore it happens that Baptism should be given only once. (in Rom. 6.5)

Baptism is the sacrament in which "the condition of spiritual nativity" is ex-

hibited, (1) and its "fruitful use" consists in its continual remembrance, and a striving to live "worthy of such a sacrament". (2) This latter teaching involves Martyr's stress on the power of the sacrament as coming from God as et author et institutor, so that whether or not there is a worthy minister, or even a "sincere spirit" in the candidate, the nature of the Sacrament remains the same. The principle here is,

Through evil ministers, good things can be ministered in the Church.

There can be false dogma within the Church, and there can be the Word of God and the sacraments outside the Church. If Baptism be repeated, the name of God is made a mockery.

And in sacraments it is not to be considered who should give or who should receive, but the thing is to be pondered by itself alone, whereby God bestows that both pure and holy.

Baptism, therefore, is the Sacrament of spiritual birth, of that event which begins a new creature. This new being requires strength, confirmation and nourishment; and these are given by the Word and the second Sacrament, the Eucharist. (3) Birth and growth as union and communion: these are the realities of Christian life which the Sacraments signify and seal.

Union and Communion.

Now should we see what it is to be in Christ. First, what is common to all mortals. For the Son of God is joined with all men because He took upon Him human nature ... But this conjunction is general, weak, and as I may say, according to matter. For the nature of man is by far disjoined from that nature which Christ took upon Him. For in Christ the human nature is immortal, free from sin, and adorned with complete purity: but our nature is impure, corruptible, and miserably contaminated by sin. But if this is gifted with the Spirit of Christ, it is so restored that it is little different from the

-
1. in I Cor. 3.2.
 2. in I Cor. 1.17.
 3. in I Cor. 3.2: the duplex ordo doctrinae and the seal of the Eucharist are instruments reborare et confirmare.

nature of Christ. Indeed such an affinity is made that Paul says in the Epistle to the Ephesians, We are flesh of His flesh and bones of His bones. This phrase of speech is seen to be drawn from the Old Testament writings. For brethren and kindred are there wont to be thus spoken of among themselves: My bone and my flesh. For, coming from the same seed of the father and the same womb of the mother, they acknowledge one matter common to themselves.

(in Rom. 8.1)

There is no doubt that this doctrine of union with Christ is the dynamic of Peter Martyr's theology. All his thought of Word and Spirit, grace and faith, sacrament and sacrifice, maintains a unity in terms of the living Body of Christ. By this Body God speaks and acts His mercy; into this Body we are reborn in faith; in this Body we are nurtured; as this Body we offer those sacrifices peculiar unto the sons of God. It is this doctrine of union with Christ as the substance of faith that preserves the dynamic tension of Scripture, when Romanism would fossilize it in static categories of logic. The implications of this basic Reformed doctrine for all theology are staggering; but particularly in regard to the doctrine of sacraments is it fruitful and determinative.

Christ actually joins Himself to man by two unions; by Incarnation and by Spirit. The latter presupposes the former, and together they reveal a union as close as it is complete.

By this it is manifest how faithful and godly men are in Christ, and that by the four kinds of causes. For Christ and we have one matter, also the same beginnings of form, for we are endowed with the same notes, properties and conditions as He had. The efficient cause, by which we are moved to work is the same Spirit whereby He was moved. Lastly, the end is the same, namely that the glory of God may be advanced.

(in Rom. 8.1)

Being in Christ implies a communication of His very "spiritual conditions and properties".⁽¹⁾ But these are no divine qualities; rather are they the qualities of the new humanity of Christ. Martyr is explicit and recurrent on this

1. in I Cor. 12.12.

point, that the Incarnation was the preparation for communicating a new humanity to men, God's own humanity because it is the humanity of His Son. The purpose of the Incarnation was to unite God to this Man so that He could unite men to this Man. Christ is

the later Adam, Who to enter upon marriage with the Church in the highest union, took flesh, blood, bones and true human nature from the Virgin's womb, that He might communicate in all these with us.

(in I Cor. 10.16)

In terms of the Incarnation, every man is "in Christ". But the second union means that Christ is "in us", for His properties are truly put into us, properties that are not "natural" as the first, general union was: freedom over sin, eternal life, even incorruptibility. ⁽¹⁾ This Martyr calls a union realiter, since we are gathered "into one mass" with Christ and "are made most conformable to Him". ⁽²⁾

This doctrine is expanded in two letters extant in Martyr's Theological Epistles, one to Calvin and one to Beza. ⁽³⁾ Here he admits the same two conjunctions or unions, with Christ, by "the benefit of His incarnation", and a second by the Holy Spirit when we receive "heavenly gifts" - those properties of the Risen Man which will be finally perfected in us at the Resurrection. But now Martyr adds a third kind or degree of union, which he calls the "mean" (medium) between them:

Therefore between the first conjunction, which I name to be of nature, and the latter which I may rightly say is of likeness or similitude, I put this mean which may be termed a conjunction of union or of secret mystery.

-
1. in I Cor. 10.16; cf. 12.12.
 2. Disp. III, vs. Tresham.
 3. Ioanni Calvino, L.C. 1094ff (from Strassburg, March 8, 1555); Theodoro Bezae, L.C. 1108f. The latter has no date or place, but its reference to Zanchus as colleague suggests that it also should be placed in the second Strassburg period of 1553-1556.

I believe that there are three degrees of our communion with Christ, and perceive that the middle, secret and mystical degree is expressed in holy scripture under the metaphor of members and head, and of husband and wife.

This "mean" is not, as one might suppose, an initial union in time, by which we are first joined to Christ in a legal manner, as in the distinction familiar to "Protestantism" between justification and sanctification. Rather is this middle degree that constant union of Christ with His members by the Spirit, apart from which there can be no likeness of the new humanity.

Wherefore this our communion with the Head is the first at least in nature, though not perhaps in time, before that latter communion which is brought in by regeneration ... While we are converted, Christ is first made ours and we His, before we become like Him in holiness and righteousness abiding in us. This is that secret communion (arcana communicio) by which we are said to be grafted into Him. Thus do we first put Him upon us, so are we called by the Apostle flesh of His flesh and bone of His bones. And by this communion now set forth, that latter is always performed while we live here.

The Head unites Himself to His members by "spiritual knots and joints", namely faith, the Word of God and the Sacraments, all of which are instruments by which the Holy Spirit quickens the members "by a just proportion" (proportione iusta) and makes them like the Head. This the "second righteousness" of which Martyr speaks so often, is here shown to be itself mediate, and dependent upon the Holy Spirit's maintaining the life-giving instrumentality of the means of grace: the "first righteousness" (by imputation) is never superseded in time. The end of it all is that we should "become daily more and more Christiformia", that is, like Christ by alteration in quality.

Thus we have "a heavenly and spiritual similitude" with Christ, of which the mean conjunction is "fountain and origin". When we consider these terms, similitudo, medium and proportio we recognise again the analogical thinking of our Reformer. The Christian is truly one becoming like Christ because he is in

Christ - but the relationship of union is not direct but analogical. Capernaite and mystic are alike condemned because here the middle term is - the Holy Spirit. He is the bond of our union with Christ. (1)

The conclusion of the teaching of this correspondence relates this middle union to the Sacraments.

And of this inward union, both Baptism and the Lord's Supper are most sure and firm tokens. For just as soon as we believe in Christ, we are made partakers of this communion: and because in a profitable receiving of the sacraments faith is necessary, therefore by it is the same conjunction both confirmed and increased while we use the sacraments. Wherefore through faith are we lifted up from the degree of nature so that we are joined to Christ as members to their Head. Further, from the immortal and heavenly Head, Whom we now possess in actual fact through faith, are derived unto us various gifts, heavenly benefits, and divine properties.

Both Sacraments are related strictly to this middle union which Martyr has described: they are signs that such a union takes place, and seals to strengthen and confirm it. The decisive thing in this complex doctrine is that the union of faith, which is a "secret communion" itself, leads to the communication of Christ's properties. We are first bound to Christ, as it were, then Christ to us. Our "coming into Christ", we could say, is the gateway to His "coming into us". The reality of the union of faith is only present by the receiving of Christ's new human properties. And the Sacraments are signs and seals of that first union, by which this second reality comes! Their purpose and effect, this context makes crystal clear, is wholly relative to the personal infilling of Jesus Christ.

This is the position from which Martyr attacks all notion of a corporeal presence

-
1. cf. the significant comments on the Fathers in Def., Part IV, esp. pp 744ff. For instance, Hilary says Christum esse in nobis naturaliter. Martyr explains that union with Christ is based upon the Incarnation (substantial) and through faith (spiritual): "we in turn apprehend His flesh through faith and eat spiritually". Therefore, he concludes, the Incarnation and the Eucharist stand in a definite relationship, but it is not identity, for the one is substantial, the other spiritual.

in the Eucharist: from his doctrine of union with Christ as the personal participation in His new humanity on the part of His members. Christ's new properties are really given to us: this is the reality of faith and the way we are related to His body and His blood. (1)

-
1. Calvin's reply to this teaching is significant (Ioan. Calvini ... Epistolae et Resp., Ep. 208, pp 391ff). It was written from Geneva, August 8, 1555. "What you had written me concerning the secret communion which is ours with Christ ... even if of great moment, yet I think by a few sound words it can be defined well between us. I will refrain from speaking of that communication in which the Son of God took our flesh, to become our brother, participant in the same nature. For only that should be treated, which spreads from His heavenly virtue and breathes life into us, and makes us coalesce in one body with Him. But I say, as soon as we receive Christ by faith, as He offers Himself in the Gospel, we are truly made His members, and life flows into us from Him as from the Head. For no other way are we reconciled to God by the sacrifice of His death, except that He is ours and we are one with Him ... we draw life from His flesh and blood, so that not unworthily are they called our nourishment ... the flesh of Christ is not per se vivifying, nor does its power come to us without the unfathomable operation of the Holy Spirit. Therefore the Spirit is He Who makes Christ abide in us, Who sustains and nourishes us, and fulfils all offices of the Head (omniaque capitis officia impleat). I preclude meanwhile entering on crass comments about mixing together the substances, since it is enough for me, while the body of Christ remains in the heavenly glory, life flows from Him to us, just as the root transmits sap to the branches ... Now I come to the second communication, which to me is the fruit and effect of that prior one. For after Christ by the interior virtue of His Spirit subdues us to Himself and unites us into His body, He follows after the virtue of His Spirit by enriching us with His gifts ... Nor yet is it absurd that when we coalesce in His body, Christ communicates His Spirit to us, whose secret operation is our first effect ... even if in this communion, the faithful come at His calling the very first day: yet since in them the life of Christ grows (augescit) daily, He offers Himself for their enjoyment. This is the communication which they receive in the holy Supper ... I have but touched this deliberation, that you may see that we feel the very same on all points". The doctrine and terminology is practically identical, and the closing words indicate the conscious agreement between Calvin and Martyr. cf. App. D on their relationship.

Union with Christ is effectively signified and sealed by both sacraments, inasmuch as substance is obtained in two ways, by birth and by nourishment:

We take the same body through the same generation and the same food ... some through Baptism are grafted into Christ, and through the Eucharist are nourished in the very same. (in I Cor. 12.13.)

Sacraments have regard to our union with Christ, Baptism indeed by way of generation, but the Eucharist by way of nourishment. (Def. 686)

Indeed, in one sense Martyr is willing to declare:

Baptism fulfils that (union with Christ) more effectively than the Eucharist, since we obtain more through generation than by nourishment or food. (in I Cor. 12.12)

For this reason the Early Church considered Baptism of greater moment than the Eucharist. But in general Martyr is content to insist on "an identical ratio in both sacraments".⁽¹⁾ This is one of the strongest arguments against transubstantiation.

Baptism is also a vivifying sacrament. But in it there is no body of Christ present realiter. (Def. 437)

We are no less joined to Christ in Baptism than we are in the Eucharist: wherefore His presence and our reception of Him, which are spiritual, are to be affirmed in both alike. (Epit., Sent. 7)

Since Sacraments have regard to our union with Christ, Baptism indeed by way of generation, but the Eucharist by way of nourishment, some presence of Christ seems necessary not only here but also there. But since that is spiritual in Baptism, and is sufficient, it should suffice also in the Eucharist. There is no reason why a sensible substance should obtain in the Eucharist rather than in Baptism. (Def. 686)

The difference between them is not one of the presence of "the truth" of sacraments, and therefore no difference in genere, only in specie.⁽²⁾

1. in utroque sacramento consimilem esse rationem - Disp. III, vs Tresham. cf. Def. 522: the same ratio et genus; 201: the modus of both Sacraments is by similitudo and therefore Baptism can as well be called fides as the Eucharist is called corpus Christi.
2. Def. 547.

Our union with Christ, which we celebrate in the Eucharist is not thus (sc. in genere) different from what we have in Baptism ... in both we receive Christ, and are renewed both in spirit and body. Yet we often teach a difference in mode, namely that in Baptism we are changed into Christ through regeneration, but in the Eucharist through spiritual nourishment. (Def. 747)

In the light of such teaching we may now ask the vital question, what does Baptism effect? Is it simply cognitive, or is it also effective?

The Effect of Baptism.

Moreover, although they believe, yet when the promises are again offered, and that by the Lord's institution, and they through faith and the impulsion of the Holy Spirit effectively grasp them, the benefits of God cannot but be augmented in them. (in Rom. 6.5)

The only sure lodestar for this difficult path is Peter Martyr's teaching about the threefold union with Christ. As we remember that the Sacraments are the Holy Spirit's instruments in order to bring to us the virtue of Christ's new humanity, we shall hold to the basic truth in the doctrine of the sacraments: that the "thing signified" by them is not a passive substance, but the dynamic Mystery, Christ Himself. The sacraments are not superfluous, nor mere signs of something past: they have a real and positive effect. Regeneration means that "we put on the properties of His nature" through the "new conjunction" of the Spirit.⁽¹⁾ And Baptism as the Sacrament of this regeneration is often simply set forth by Martyr thus: "In Baptism we are changed into Christ", since we are made "participators in the divine nature".⁽²⁾

What Baptism concerns is the Christiformia, Christ's growth in us, which we have denoted as the reality of our union with Christ.⁽³⁾ Indeed, Martyr

1. Def. 751

2. Def. 745, 747.

3. Martyr's clearest teaching on this is given in the next Chapter, in the section on 'The Nourishment of the Body of Christ'.

himself says, in this context of the effect of Baptism:

It is possible to say that we are more perfectly in Christ than He is in us. (Def. 752)

For human nature exists in Him in perfection, without flaw. And it is this perfect new humanity which we begin to put on in Baptism. (1) Faith means that we become "partakers of the properties of the human nature of Christ". (2) Faith is no less than "a union according to the flesh" (3) since all the benefits of God are derived to us "through the flesh of Christ" once broken for us, (4) and because we experience a mutation into this same Christ. (5) The elements of the Sacraments, Martyr says, are consecrated and so changed into sacraments,

to this end alone, to effect and induce (as much as instruments can) our mutation. (Def. 763)

When the Fathers will confirm the change made in the Eucharist, they bring as example the change of our selves, which is made in Baptism: this change the Apostle too seems to declare very great. For he uses the names of life and death, between which there must needs be a very great change. (in Rom. 6.4)

In Baptism, then, there is a definite change of ourselves, which Martyr apparently identifies with the change effected by justification. But not so: this he explicitly denies. For this is what the theologians of Trent thought, with their doctrine of the preparatio gratiae:

But these men see not that we must far otherwise judge of Baptism. For Scripture teaches that Abraham was first justified by faith in uncircumcision, and then received circumcision as a seal of the righteousness already received. This same consideration, according to the analogy, must be kept in baptism: for our baptism answers

1. Def. 763.

2. Def. 413.

3. coniunctio secundum carnem: Def. 750, where Martyr deals with Cyril's doctrine of union with Christ according to three modes: Incarnation; the Spirit, Who gives us that same flesh; and, the communication of the properties, conditions and graces of His flesh.

4. Def. 751.

5. Def. 763.

to the circumcision of the fathers of the Old Testament. (De Iustific. 8)

A seal to justification by faith: this is the essential meaning of the Sacrament.

A sufficient definition, Martyr states, is Paul's:

sacraments are *σφραγίδες*, that is, sealings of the righteousness of faith. For they seal the promises by which, if faith is joined to them, we are justified ... Wherefore every man may see how much they are deceived that think the sacraments are only marks and notes of piety ... the head and sum of their signification is that they seal. (in Rom. 4.11)

Baptism is therefore not only the sign but the seal of justification by faith, which for Martyr means union with Christ. Baptism is related to the remission of sins, not indeed causally (*opus operato*), but significantly (as *σφραγις*) and also instrumentally (as *σφραγίς*), according to the gracious working of the Holy Spirit. ⁽¹⁾ The sealing office of Baptism means that it is effective as well as cognitive. In a thorough examination of this decisive point, Martyr sums up this teaching:

The cause of sanctification is Christ Himself, Who gave Himself for us, and for that reason gave the washing of water, that His cleansing might be attested by the Word and the symbol. Briefly this must be held: outward signs do not join us to Christ, but are given when we are already joined to Him ... to be made a member of Christ precedes baptism, but to express this in manners and life follows ... we were of the body of Christ before, but to testify and seal this, we are outwardly baptized ... justification depends not on baptism, but precedes it. (De Temp. Ded. 18,19)

Once again we see that faith is always related to the analogical nature of the activity of God's Word and Spirit. Martyr continues:

But perhaps you will say, To what end then is Baptism delivered to them, if they had the substance of baptism before? Is the labour spent there in vain? Not at all. First, because we obey God, Who commanded to us the work of baptism. Second, we seal the promise and gift which we have received. Moreover, faith is there confirmed by the Holy Spirit, through the Word and outward signs. And as we ourselves think of this visible Word or sacrament, the Spirit of God stirs up faith in our hearts, by

1. in I Cor. 4.11: *σφραγις* is a general word, while *σφραγίς* is more definitely sacramental; e.g. "an image is a sign, but it cannot be seal".

which again and again we embrace the divine promises, and so justification is amplified, while faith is increased in believers. God specially assists the signs instituted by Him. For they are no profane or empty things. Wherefore the fruit of baptism is not momentary, but extends through the whole life. Thus those who are baptized neither waste their work nor act in vain. (De Templ. Ded. 20)

Does Martyr teach an augmentum gratiae? Not if we interpret this in terms of a deposit of grace related to external signs, or even to "Spirit" in a less than Personal meaning. But inasmuch as "grace" for him means the work of the Word and Spirit in uniting us to the new humanity of Jesus Christ, there is no reason why the personal growth of our union with Christ may not be thought in terms of additions or increases.

The Church is a body quickened by the Spirit of God, which increases not otherwise than a living body is naturally formed, little by little. (Catech. 47)

Again and again Martyr stresses this positive effect of Baptism as the decisive act which seals our union with Christ and gives access to that growth which is correspondingly increased through the Eucharist. (1)

Moreover although they believe, yet when the promises are again offered, and that by the Lord's institution, and they through faith and the impulsion of the Holy Spirit effectively grasp them, the benefits of God cannot but be augmented in them ... by the visible sacrament we are grafted into Christ and the Church ... the right to eternal life is sealed to us by baptism. (in Rom. 6.5)

Martyr can even say that regeneration "is brought with" baptism:

a sacrament may be of the same value as is the Word of God. For just as this Word signifies and gives in truth to believers, whatever it promises, so baptism being received by faith, both signifies and gives to believers remission of sins, which it promises by a visible speaking. (Catech. 45)

This question of baptism as deed as well as word concerned Martyr chiefly

1. cf. esp. in Rom. 4.11; 6.5; 7.17.

because of his Patristic studies. ⁽¹⁾ Yet it is the obvious question in view of his basic stress on justification by faith, if this is related to the Church's sacramental life in categories of logic alone, which rationalize every doctrine. If justification precedes baptism, Martyr says, what profit then hath the sacrament? ⁽²⁾ Consider Cornelius, who possessed the Spirit before baptism, or Jacob -

He was loved of God being an infant, was born of faithful parents, and truly belonged unto the covenant of God ... What had he by the sacrament that he had not before?

Much every way: in three ways, to be precise. First, "the commandment of the Lord must be fulfilled". Second:

the gifts already obtained ... must be sealed with the outward sign, that we may be continually mindful of them, to take occasion by this to exercise our faith, and to be admonished of our duty.

Third, baptism is a Church act, a corporate act, with a corresponding significance for adult or infant:

Moreover there are added the prayers of the minister, the vows of those who offer, things which profit the infant not a little: and the Church which stands by at the ministration of that Sacrament is taught concerning salvation.

God is pleased to amplify His gifts thus promised, "by His goodness and Spirit". So Martyr concludes, "Do these things avail little, or are they unprofitable?"

A further point in relation to the sealing of baptism is that it is not to be neglected. Martyr does not regard it as necessary for salvation:

Every faithful man should be baptized if possible: but when he cannot have a minister he is excused. (De Schism. 42)

But if one omit this sacrament through contempt, the omission is a positive "hindrance" to salvation. ⁽³⁾ Indeed he even declares:

1. cf. G.W.H. Lampe, 'The Seal of the Spirit' (Longmans, 1951) Part IV, 'Patristic Theories of Sealing' for an excellent summary of the doctrines, which form Martyr's presupposition in his teaching on baptism.
2. This teaching is from the Comm. in I Cor. 7.14.
3. in Rom. 7.17.

If any man condemns the sacrament of baptism, he will be excluded from the kingdom of heaven. For those who have entered into belief, must take special heed to this, that they be ingrafted into the Church by the sacrament. (in Rom. 7.25)

Finally:

although the sacrament is given but once, yet it ought never to be forgotten in our whole lifetime ... For the property of signs is not to profit only at the time when they are present. Otherwise we should be baptized continually ... The sealing of the promise of God which we receive in baptism never loses its force and strength. (in Rom. 6.5; 6.10)

Peter Martyr's complex and fruitful teaching on Baptism involves the question provoked by the Anabaptist reduction of faith to a cognitive-subjective level: should infants be baptized? For Martyr states explicitly:

Sacraments are seals of the promises of God, and confirmations of our faith. But if faith is absent, what can be either sealed or confirmed? (in I Sem. 15.22)

What, then, can be the reason for the baptizing of infants? Martyr brings two chief reasons, closely related: circumcision as the O.T. analogue of baptism, and Predestination.

Circumcision and Covenant.

In circumcision and baptism it is a perpetual matter that those who belong to the covenant of God and are joined to the people of God should be marked by some outward sign; but yet the kind of sign was changeable and temporal. (in I Cor. 15.2)

Although Peter Martyr's theology cannot simply be termed "federal", the doctrine of the one covenant of grace is operative throughout his doctrine of the sacraments as the Scriptural background of all he has to say. His doctrine of infant baptism rests upon the analogy which Scripture draws between the O.T. sacrament of circumcision and the N.T. sacrament of baptism - but this in turn rests upon the Christological unity of Scripture. The argument from circum-

cision as analogue is not an after-thought introduced by Reformed theology in defence of a Romanist doctrine carried on in inconsistency with justification by faith, (1) but is the unavoidable implication of its Christological view of revelation. Thus Martyr says of the Anabaptists:

They seem to be wiser than God: for God doubtless knew that Circumcision contained a promise of Christ, and a profession of mortification and of new life. For by the prophets He continually urges the Circumcision of the heart, which was signified by that Sacrament, and yet He commanded that infants should be initiated unto Him by circumcision ... They also are not to be listened to that say circumcision was only the sealing of promises concerning temporal things.
(in Rom. 6.5)

The historical evidence is secondary: for example, that since Cyprian and Origen take infant baptism for granted, nor mention its institution, it must be Apostolic in origin. (2) What is determinative is the dogmatic element: Christ instituted Baptism, and as the N.T. sacrament of regeneration (mortification and new life) it is by definition analogous to the O.T. sacrament of circumcision. Therefore unless our infants are "in a worse state" than the Hebrew children, they are to be baptized.

Baptisms were before the law, in the law, and under the Gospel; and all, as regards their substance, had the same force. It is not true that the ceremonies of antiquity were but outward exercises, in which was no remission of sins.

(Prop. ex Exod. 18, nec. 11, 12)

This dogmatic basis rests chiefly on Paul's relating circumcision and baptism in Romans 4 and Colossians 2, along with the foundational passage, Genesis

-
1. as proponents of so-called "believer's baptism" commonly charge.
 2. in Rom. 6.5; cf. on 5.19: "Baptism was appointed by tradition from the apostles, to be given unto infants; because the apostles knew that the natural corruption of sin is in all men, which ought to be washed away by water and the Spirit". As to the actual origin of the rite, Martyr says (in II Reg. 2.23) "John Baptist introduced a new rite of Baptism and gave it to the Hebrews".

17. (1) Although these passages do not yield an explicit command to baptize infants, Martyr declares their clear teaching of this, just as the doctrine of ^c ομολογία was defended as Scriptural by Athanasius, who declared against the Arians that he contended not de vocabulo but de reipsa. (2)

Unto doctrine nothing should be thought necessary save what is gathered from the holy Scriptures, either expressly or by clear and solid reason: such as concerning the baptism of infants, and concerning homousio. (in I Sam. 14.52, De Leg. Ecc.)

Commenting on Matthew 22.32, Martyr states that here Christ brings no express testimony, but only inference, in support of the resurrection from the dead; just so -

whereas they contend with us for the baptism of children, they will have us to bring out of the Scriptures express, plain and manifest words by which it is affirmed that children should be baptized. Nor will they be content with reasons and conclusions derived from the Scriptures. (De Resurrectione, 25)

The reasons and conclusions are plain enough, according to Martyr: they are summed up in the name covenant.

Baptism is given us in place of circumcision, as Paul clearly writes to the Colossians. Now unless you wish our little ones to have fallen into a condition below the sons of Israel, just as they were circumcised in infancy, so you will acknowledge our children to be admitted to baptism. What in that reason I pray you, is opposed out of Scripture? Do you doubt the infants of Christians to pertain to God as the sons of the Hebrews did? (De Vot. 1373D)

It is manifestly false to distinguish two covenants according to categories of law/grace or works/faith. We have already considered this in Chapter 2; and the implication of Martyr's doctrine of the presence of Christ in the O.T. is clear. Circumcision must be:

-
1. For Peter Martyr's detailed teaching on circumcision and infant baptism, see the Commentaries in Gen. 17.2 (Fol. 68Aff), in I Reg. 8.66 (De Templ. Ded., Fol. 68Aff), in Rom. 4.9FF, 6.5, in I Cor. 1.17, 7.14.
 2. De Vot. 1345, Obj. V.

a sign, or to speak more properly a sealing of the promise and covenant made with God through Christ ... By this sacrament also the mortifying of the flesh and filthy lusts were marked. This rite was to the old Fathers instead of Baptism, and was accounted the sacrament of regeneration. Wherefore it appears that our infants should be abptized, since their lot is no worse than that of the Hebrews' children, yea rather it is many ways happier.

(in Rom. 2.25)

Circumcision, as Chrysostom said, is double, inward as well as outward, of spirit as well as of flesh - and indeed there is between these a mean, proceeding from the one and agreeable to the other. ⁽¹⁾ Perhaps the best summary of this phase of Martyr's doctrine is given in the Commentary on I Corinthians 7.14, which we shall give in some detail.

God first entered into covenant not only with Abraham but with his whole family, and willed that not only Abraham but all his household servants and slaves should pertain to the covenant - among whom no doubt were many little ones. Afterward followed circumcision. By this it is evident that the promise, pact or covenant was not brought in by circumcision but preceded it. This same fact must be understood about Baptism: for first the Word was preached to citizens or heads of families, and the covenant to be entered upon through Christ was proclaimed. When they had been kindled by faith, and submitted themselves to the covenant, baptism followed, not only with regard to them, but also to their little ones, who were recognized to be comprehended in the covenant. St. Paul says that he baptized the house of Stephanos. And in the Acts of the Apostles, as we said before, not only the master of the prison but also all those that belonged unto him received baptism.

This covenant, Martyr continues, was not temporal, since it was the revelation of God Himself, deliverance "from sin, death and damnation". Nor was the promise dependent upon the flesh, upon human generation, since it was preserved "only by the power and efficacy of God's mercy". God was merciful to the Hebrews and their children: this was His covenant.

Nor are we to doubt that the same covenant is applied to our children, unless we will count God to be less pitiful and merciful unto us than He was to the Hebrews: as though by the coming of Christ His grace were diminished.

1. in Rom. 2.25; 2.28.

This is the covenant to which the infants pertained, and which was sealed in their bodies by the sacrament of regeneration.

In the Epistle to the Colossians circumcision is most plainly compared with our baptism. (Col. 2.11-12) ... Wherefore our baptism is of no less account than was Circumcision, for it sealed the covenant and promise in the young children of the Hebrews, which we must judge to be done by Baptism.

What was sealed in circumcision? This seems to be the key to Martyr's use of the Pauline analogy. For his normative definition of a sacrament is seal, so that what is sealed is presupposed in the administration of the rite. In adults the answer is obvious. In children, however, it is the promise of the divine words which is sealed, or the communication. ⁽¹⁾ We count them grafted into the Church by "the Word of God and promise of the covenant" and so include them in the sacrament of regeneration. The Word of promise is determinative. ⁽²⁾

the covenant and promise excludes them not, nay rather they are generally signified in these words, in which the Lord says, 'I will be thy God and the God of thy seed' (Gen. 17.7) under which promise we baptize them, and visibly incorporate them into the Church; who yet, when they come of age may reject the covenant and condemn the Gospel. (in Rom. 11.22)

Because children of Christian parents, being addressed by the Word of promise "pertain unto the Church and unto Christ", ⁽³⁾ therefore they should be "defended and confirmed" with the outward sign "like a seal to gifts". ⁽⁴⁾ Finally therefore,

what faith brings about in adults before they are baptized, that the Spirit of Christ and the promise work in infants ... God doubtless has the number of His children most certain, whom He predestinated from all

-
1. cf. De Templ. Ded. 18: the covenant is the matter of infant baptism and it precedes; "afterward follows the outward symbol".
 2. in I Cor. 7.14, As a farmer seals his livestock and a king his letters patent: so the Church "baptizes those whom it supposes to belong unto it, and who are not strangers from it".
 3. in Rom. 6.5.
 4. De Vot. 1374A.

eternity. But the promise of the covenant with the stock of Abraham is of no certain number, and expressly excludes none of his successors. And so when the children of believers are offered to the Church to be baptized, this has respect unto the promise as it is uttered.

(De Templ. Ded. 20)

"The Spirit of Christ and the promise", "whom He predestinated" - here is the ultimate theological reference of the entire discussion. For this cuts across the whole adult-infant problem in terms of the Author and Finisher of faith, and of His secret will.

Original Sin and Predestination.

Peter Martyr constantly refers the question of infant baptism to two related doctrines: original sin and election or predestination. For between these is an analogy, "the consideration of seed".⁽¹⁾ Original sin is like a seed "poured in by generation"; Christ in turn begets to Himself members through His seed - election, grace, the Spirit, the Word of God and Baptism. The last two are significant as the outward instruments of regeneration.

But if a man ask whether the outward Word or the visible sign of baptism is wholly necessary, we answer that indeed the inward Word, by which men are moved unto Christ and reformed, is absolutely required, if we speak of them that are of mature age; but in children, neither has the inward Word place, nor is the outward Word the ordinary instrument. (in Rom. 5.19)

The distinction between the inward and outward Word is most important. God has a "signifying" will, which extends through outward calling to all men; but His "effectual" will is not coextensive with that.⁽²⁾ But since both refer to the calling by the Word in accommodation to the human mind, and the response of faith,

1. in Rom. 5.19. We may term these the negative and positive reasons for infant baptism.
2. in I Sam. 2.25; cf. in Gen. 12.1: God's calling is efficax et inefficax: the latter is by outward sign, the former has salvation added, plena persuasio intus et in animo.

Martyr declares them irrelevant here. There is no "deposit of faith" in infants: a biological analogy will not do to describe this beginning.

I know that it has been thought by some, and those of no small esteem, that infants have faith, as though God works in them in a wondrous way and beyond the course of nature - whose opinion (to speak the truth) I do not embrace very readily. (1)

Moreover (Lutherans) believe that infants are endued with faith, which neither you nor we believe, who think it sufficient unto their salvation that they are endued with the Spirit of Christ, Who is the root and origin of faith, and Who at such time as He thinks good, will stir up faith in them. (2)

Martyr rejects the biological analogy of a "seed" of the future faith already present as a deposit in predestinated infants, as the cause of their being baptized. But does he thereby reduce predestination to an objective "decree"? Not at all, it has a valid subjective reference: the infant "has" the Holy Spirit, Who will summon faith when response is possible.

But since holy Scripture tells me not that little ones believe, or that these miracles (a wondrous working) are done in them, nor do I see this to be necessary to their salvation, I judge it sufficient to affirm that those who shall be saved, forasmuch as by election and predestination they belong unto the treasure of God, are endowed with the Spirit of God, Who is the root of faith, hope, charity and all virtues, which He afterwards shows forth and declares in the children of God, when through age it may be done.

(in I Cor. 7.14)

This means that the Holy Spirit is the "matter" of the covenant-promise in in-

-
1. in I Cor. 7.14. Is he thinking of Calvin here? In the Institutes, III. 16.18, Calvin used the biological analogy, although it represents there the expression of the eschatological nature of faith, which Martyr also sought.
 2. Letter Ecclesiae Anglicanae, L.C. 1098f, written at the time when the Lutherans were persecuting Reformed Churchmen who fled England at Mary's accession. Thus the question was raised, should we allow Lutherans elsewhere to baptize us; and also, should we rebaptize those baptized by Lutherans? Martyr strongly speaks against repetition of Lutheran or Papist baptism. To the first he says, since Baptism is a seal, we cannot deliver our faith to be sealed by those who detest it.

infants that are predestinated: He may be said to "instruct" such infants, and to "secretly work regeneration in them".⁽¹⁾ Indeed, at one point Martyr says that the infant could be thought of as "born again by the Word of God".⁽²⁾ What is the significance of this debate about the "seed of faith"? In an interesting passage he writes of original sin:

But by the promise and force of the covenant it is forgiven - when God works this forgiveness we cannot learn from the testimony of Scripture. In infants it is perhaps forgiven when they are yet in the womb, or when they are born, or right after birth, nor is it likely given to all men at the same time. (in Rom. 11.14)

Martyr thus acknowledges that we cannot rationalize the mode of the Divine activity, which is accommodated differently to adults and infants. But what is more important is that he seeks to guarantee the nature of faith as eschatological: there is a delay before the reality of faith is revealed in the resurrection, which was symbolized by the delay of circumcision until the eighth day.⁽³⁾ For the sacrament of regeneration - whether circumcision or baptism - is by definition a sacrament the reality of which is future and bound up with resurrection. The reality is not temporally identifiable with the sign. Baptism means into Christ, into His Body, the Body wherein nourishment is received and growth increased, as

-
1. in I Cor. 7.14 and in Rom. 2.25. In the latter passage Martyr rejects Augustine's view that salvation may come to infants by the faith of them that offer them, on the ground that in adults their own faith is required, and in children "the Holy Spirit and grace" works the regeneration. But in his letter Ecc. Ang. he states that infant baptism seals the faith of the adults who offer them. This single reference ought to be compared with the former, and then related to his insistence that Baptism is a corporate act, by which the whole Church benefits - e.g. in Rom. 4.12.
 2. De Templ. Ded. 20.
 3. in Rom. 4.12: "the sins of the flesh can never be perfectly cut off from us, until we come to the holy resurrection".

Christ is formed in us. Baptism is therefore in a profound sense into a future regeneration. (1)

Finally, therefore, it is the covenant promise and presence of the Holy Spirit which is the basis for infant baptism. Men are called simply to "follow the signs and tokens of election", namely, the having of faith in an adult, the having of Christian parents in a child.

And if with the action of the sacraments are joined election and predestination, that which we do is ratified; but if not, then is it void. (in Rom. 4.12)

Obviously there is a risk here! But is not the risk present in the case of adult baptism, even though different in degree? In either case a judgment is required, and human judgment is fallible.

But you will say, you may be deceived, since perhaps the child will not pertain to the number of the elect. I answer that the same difficulty may also happen to those of adult age. For perhaps one may profess faith with a false heart, or may be led only by human persuasion, or may have faith but only for a time; so that in actual fact he does not pertain to the elect. Yet the minister has not a regard for these things ... but waits upon the general promise; though many are excluded from this, yet is it none of his part to define which they are. (in Rom. 5.19)

Since the reason of this election is hidden, and the first token we have is that children belong to them that are holy and are offered by them in the sacrament of regeneration, therefore we call them holy, although as has been noted, this token may deceive: just as also the confession of faith expressed in words by adults when about to be baptized, may lie and proceed from hypocrisy. (in I Cor. 7.14)

Some demand that since we know not whether infants have the matter of the sacrament, why do we give them the sign, and seal what is uncertain to us? To whom we reply: this question is not brought against us but against the Word of God. For He expressly commanded and willed that children should be circumcised. Again, let them answer us, why they admit adults to baptism or communion, since they are uncertain of their mind? For those who are baptized or communicate can be false, and deceive the Church. They reply, it is enough to have their

-
1. even though Martyr can say parvulos iustificatos aut regeneratos ante baptismum (Goode's 'Unpublished Letter of P.M. to Bullinger').

profession: if they lie, what is that to us? they say, let them see to that. So say we of infants, that it is enough for us that they are offered to the Church, either by parents or by those in whose power they are. (in Rom. 4.12)

To conclude this account of Peter Martyr's doctrine of infant baptism, we may briefly indicate his reaction to two doctrines that developed, particularly in the England whose Prayer Book he had so greatly influenced. (1) To the doctrine of baptismal regeneration he would surely give a quick and decided "No!", as our section on 'The Effect of Baptism' suggests. Apart from such specific statements as those which say "Justification precedes baptism", there is the basic presupposition of his whole doctrine, faith as union with Christ by the Holy Spirit, which precludes the denial of the sacrament as sign and seal implied in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. As to Confirmation, he has one passing reference which is significant:

Not do we dislike that confirmation, by which children, when they come to age should be made to confess their faith in the Church, and by outward profession approve what was done in Baptism when they understood nothing - yet of such an action we do not frame a sacrament. (2)

Moreover, his doctrine of the Church, despite its acceptance of the office of Bishop - at least in terms of the understanding of that office held by his friends the English Reformers - would deal hardly with the subsequent arrogation of power over confirmation by the episcopal office. (3)

Martyr's doctrine ends on a note of "hoping well" of the children baptized

1. cf. introductory 'Portrait' IV, 'The Prayer Book, etc.'
2. in De Poenit.: 14 deals with the question of the episcopal laying on of hands. The Romanist rite had preserved the sign while the signification had long since passed. In the Early Church the significance of having the Bishop for this rite was ad honorem sacerdotii, non ex necessitate praecepti (Hieron. contra Lucif.), so that Inutilis ergo est confirmatio, nisi primo modo servetur.
3. cf. the Treatises noted in Chapter 4.

into the Church of Christ.

Because we should not be over curious in searching out the secret providence and election of God, therefore we judge the children of the saints to be saints, so long as by reason of age they do not declare themselves to be strangers from Christ. We exclude them not from the Church, but embrace them as members, hoping well, that as they are the seed of the saints after the flesh, so also may they partake of the divine election, and have the Holy Spirit and grace of Christ; and for this reason we baptize them. (in I Cor. 7.14)

CHAPTER VI : THE SACRAMENT OF COMMUNICATION.

A communion of spirit is a society of those men who participate in the same spirit. Thus have Christians society among themselves, and a union based on this, that they are partakers of the body and blood of Christ. (in I Cor. 10.16)

In this Chapter we shall try to outline Peter Martyr's positive teaching upon the Lord's Supper, or to use his favourite name for it, the Eucharist. Part III will treat the details of this doctrine as these were called forth in controversy with Romanist, Lutheran and Anabaptist opposition. First we ought to review certain main bases of his sacramental teaching. These are three. First, faith means union with Christ. Justification has substance in the realm of being as well as of knowledge. Sanctification means the increase of this union, but always deriving from the ongoing union from the side of Christ. Second, this growth has as its nourishment the Word of God as the "chief food of the soul". It is Christ Himself Who grows in the believer, by the continual apprehension of His Person. Third, this apprehension is dependent upon the effective action of the Holy Spirit, Who uses earthly elements as signs through and from which He raises up the mind and soul to grasp the Risen Man, Jesus Christ.

Now let us see how these bases make for a doctrine of the Eucharist as distinctive as it is fruitful, at once dynamic and personal, yielding neither to the temptation to make too much of the earthly elements, ~~not~~ too little.

Communication and the Word.

God everywhere required that we should hear His voice: which is nothing else than to deal with Him by faith. (in Iud. 2.23)

Revelation means the self-communication of God, that is, the union of man with Christ. This is the work of the Holy Spirit, Who uses two instruments mutually related and apposite. These are, the Word of God and faith. Where the Holy Spirit unites us to Christ, there His instrument is the Word of God; where the Word of God is, there man has but one response, faith. This principle is fundamental to the Reformed doctrine of the sacraments.

I would not admit that the sacraments, either ours or theirs of ancient times, give grace of themselves. For whatever grace we have, we obtain by faith, and not (as you imagine) because of the work done. Nor do we thus make sacraments more contemptible: since we determine that they, when received aright, help, confirm and increase faith, by which alone are we justified. For the Holy Spirit, as He uses the words of God and the scriptures like instruments to change and to save us; so likewise He uses the sacraments ... And since faith is obtained by the Word, the more manifest that Word is, the more earnestly is faith stirred up, and the more does it apprehend the thing signified ... the clarity and plainness of the sacraments must be chiefly regarded in the words. Because, if you compare the words with the elements, the words are their life. (Disp., closing speech)

The sacraments by definition are not per se the communication of life, since that is a different ordo: that pertains to the Word of God and to faith - "Where the Word of God is not, there faith cannot be". (1) The communication in the sacraments is thus not of the same order as the elements themselves -

1. ubi non est verbum dei, nec fides esse potest. Def. 79.

this is the definition of sacramentum! - but is located in the Word. In this sense, the body and blood of the Eucharist are the body and blood of the Word of God.⁽¹⁾ For it is not human blood which saves man, not even Christ's blood "as blood of a mere man" (ut puri hominis sanguis), but that which removes sin is the blood of the Word, and the Word is grasped only by faith.

In this context, faith is the one instrument from the human side, for communication of the union with Christ. It is therefore the only preparation for the Eucharist which man can have. This also agrees with the Scriptural definition of a sacrament, upon which Martyr lays such stress: a sacrament is a seal of that grace which comes by Word unto faith. There is a fixed and definite order to be observed, therefore, in the case of the Eucharist at least:

faith ought always to go before the receiving of the sacraments, if we receive them aright, and the order be not inverted. For as without faith men eat and drink unworthily, so without faith baptism is unworthily received: yet this must be understood regarding adults. For as regards the way with infants, we will elsewhere declare. Then, if faith precede, it is manifest that sins are forgiven; because the sacraments that follow seal and confirm us, concerning the will of God.
(in Rom. 11.27)

Faith and the Soul of Man.

Faith as the instrument by which alone Christ is communicated unto us, poses the question as to whether that implies a purely subjective and anthropocentric understanding of man's relation to God. Our study of Peter Martyr's theology to this point ought to deny such a conclusion; yet we must analyse his terms in relation to the reception of the Eucharist, where he speaks much of the mind (mens) and soul or spirit (animus) of man.

1. Def. 76: Peter Martyr cites Origen: ne haereas in sanguinem carnis, sed disce potius sanguinem verbi ... Novit qui mysteriis imbutus est, et carnem et sanguinem verbi dei.

Wherefore the wicked, who are destitute of that instrument by which the body and blood of the Lord are received, namely faith, do for that reason not receive the things themselves which are signified, but receive only the signs of those things. But those who are prepared with faith, just as with the mouth of the body they eat and drink the signs, so by the mouth of the mind they truly receive the body and blood of Christ. (Conf. Argent. 1556)

This shows clearly not only the primacy of faith as the instrument of communication, but also the analogy which stands at the heart of the sacrament. This analogy, which we earlier traced in the objective relationship between sign and matter as upheld by the Holy Spirit, is now referred to the person of the Christian according to the distinction between the "mouth of the body" and the "mouth of the mind" (os corporis and os mentis). This latter is not mental in our modern sense, but is identifiable with the spirit or soul - it is also called the os animi.

The form (figura) is given by the hand and received with the mouth of the body, but the actuality (res), that is the true flesh of Christ, is offered by the words of the Lord and grasped by the mouth of the soul through faith; and we eat Him spiritually, while we believe that He was truly given for us on the Cross. (Def. 63)

The Sacrament contains two things, not one - and not a tertium quid identifying the two in a new entity⁽¹⁾ - namely, sign and signification. The truth of the reception of the sacrament, therefore, depends upon a "twofold eating" (duplex manducatio), one of the res Sacramenti, a "spiritual and true" eating, the other of the sign only.⁽²⁾ We may note in this connection that for Martyr, the sign or symbol is usually called "the sacrament", and therefore he can distinguish the spiritual eating from the "sacramental" eating. In this sense the wicked eat the sacrament of the body of Christ. Indeed, he even calls the consecrated elements "spiritual things" because of their signification, so that the elements,

1. as Chedsey claimed - Disp. II.

2. cf. esp. in I Cor. 10.17 for this teaching.

if eaten at all, make for a "spiritual" eating - but this terminology, as we saw, depends upon the verbal communication of properties - properly speaking, there is but one eating of Christ, that explained in John 6.

The problem of "subjectivity" in this doctrine will be readily solved when we consider that faith is instrumental to the communication of Christ Himself. Faith is not mental knowledge, it is that by which the believer receives the communion of the Person of Christ. In the Sacrament it is this Person of Christ that is the substance or matter, to which the elements are but instruments ordained by Christ Himself.

The sacrament of the Eucharist I confess is so instituted by Christ our Saviour that, His words being used, which promise a true communion of the faithful with Him, and adding symbols of bread and wine, which are effectual instruments of the Holy Spirit unto the faithful while the holy Supper is celebrated; faith is excited in us, by which we truly and unfeignedly apprehend in the soul both His body and blood, even as they were delivered unto death and to the Cross for us, unto the remission of sins. Which receiving, although of things absent, and done in the soul (animo fiat), yet it not only profits the soul itself, but redounds unto the body of them that receive, so that by a certain power of sanctification and of spiritual conjunction, it is made capable of the blessed resurrection and eternal life. Wherefore neither in the symbols, nor in the communicants themselves, do I admit a real or substantial or corporeal presence of the body of Christ.
(Conf. Argent. 1556)

In this same context Martyr states that unless the communion with Christ is enjoyed before the eating of the Eucharist (ante sumptionem Eucharistiae), we are aliens from Him since we lack faith. The object of the Supper is not to unite us to Christ by an earthly means, but to increase (crescere) in us that union which the Holy Spirit creates and sustains by instrumental means of grace. Faith is to be defined as "the instrument of uniting us to Christ".⁽¹⁾

The deep question with which Peter Martyr confronts us here is, what is the

1. Epit., Sent. 9.

object of faith? He insists again and again that faith does not have fictitious objects, it grasps a real Christ, real in His body and in His blood. Faith cannot be dismissed as "subjective" unless we deny that faith has power to apprehend a real presence of Christ.

The "Real Presence" of the Body of Christ.

The problematic nature of the Eucharist has arisen because men confused two categories or orders implied by the nature of the sacrament. They forgot that by the mouth only quantity can be received - the bodily reception does not extend to spiritual substance. ⁽¹⁾ "The mouth of the body cannot have a spiritual action". ⁽²⁾ The difference between the mouth of the body and the mouth of the soul is the difference between spirit and flesh. ⁽³⁾ To annul this difference is to make the error of which the Capernaïtes were guilty. For the bodily mouth, by definition, cannot attain to anything but earthly elements, except by signification. The os corporis is essentially "the faculty for apprehending flesh" that is, for apprehending a creature. But the flesh of Christ is grasped by faith, which is "in the soul", not in the body, not in the mouth".

Therefore for this reason I say that the body of Christ cannot be eaten properly. For what is not chewed with the teeth and digested, is not said to be really eaten. But this no sane person will attribute unto the body of the Lord. (Def. 1, 3-4)

The key to the doctrine of the sacraments lies in the Christological thinking of the Reformers. Union with the Risen Man is not the problem of the "divinised flesh" of transubstantiation, but of the new "spiritual men" of the Church. Christ!

-
1. Disp., II, q 2, vs. Ched.
 2. Os corporis non potest habere actionem spiritualem - Def. 160.
 3. Def. 161: Tantum enim interest spirituales manducationem, et corporealem, quantum inter spiritum, et corpus.

flesh as creaturely is removed from us by distance of place,⁽¹⁾ but we are changed so that we apprehend Him as He truly is.⁽²⁾ Indeed, Martyr declares, we only have the true Body of Christ by the spiritual presence which corresponds to faith.⁽³⁾ For what if non habemus corpus Christi? Can that hinder what we seek?⁽⁴⁾ In fact:

This communion with the Lord is not less than if it were given as the transubstantiators imagine: nay rather it is more excellent, since we obtain it through better instruments, and by more eminent faculties.
(in I Cor. 11.24)

For the "things themselves" of the Sacrament are received according to the mode of faith. Now just here we reach the source of everything that Martyr has to say about the Eucharist. The fountainhead of his profound and complex doctrine is this: the virtue of the risen Body descends from heaven.⁽⁵⁾ Time and again he emphasizes the "force and power" of Christ's body and blood, their "virtue and efficacy".⁽⁶⁾ This is our union with Christ, namely our union with the new humanity of the Risen Lord, through the virtus and vis of His body and blood.

It will be obvious at this point that the spatial terminology used by Martyr, whose stress on the sursum corda is a basic factor in his sacramental theology, is not adequate for the reality it seeks to express. For here we find that he is willing to speak of Christ's "descending" to the Supper, inasmuch as "with faith and the Spirit" the recipients feed and are restored⁽⁷⁾ by the presence of Christ

-
1. Def. 560
 2. Catech. 31ff: the Holy Spirit "works a wonderful transformation" in us: the analogical motion does something to us, not to its "object".
 3. Def. 387.
 4. Def. 464.
 5. Dial. 34C: "How does (Christ) say that the bread of God lives and descends from heaven? ... Because the virtue of the risen body descended from heaven. That which has virtue is ascribed to the flesh".
 6. Def. 9; Def. 287; cf. 298, etc.
 7. vescamur et instauremur - Def. 5.

Himself. Our plea is, he says, "that Christ should come from heaven by His Spirit.⁽¹⁾ What Martyr wishes to avoid is that "Christ-absent" sacramental teaching of the Swiss;⁽²⁾ yet his doctrine is not rooted in polemical theorizing, but in acknowledgment of the positive communication which the Sacrament effects. This is his principle:

the body of Christ may be joined to us in such a way that we are one with Him, though by substantial and corporeal presence in the Eucharist He is absent from us. (in I Cor. 12.12)

Martyr is claiming that the Sacrament becomes problematical only when a false antithesis obscures the relationship: the Romanist teaches that the absence of a corporeal Body means the absence of grace. But, says Martyr, grace means union with Christ as the new humanity communicated to us by the Spirit: this demands that the Body of Christ be present in the mode of faith, spiritually, and absent in the mode of sense, corporeally.

The word that requires examination here is faith. For Martyr, faith is distinguished by one unique power: it overcomes distance to make present the reality that is its object. Hebrews 11.1 is his favourite text in this respect: the object of faith is "substance": πίστις implies ὑποστάσις.⁽³⁾ This is the property of faith, and without its correlative substance, faith is no true faith. Our "firm union" with Christ is the work of faith, which leads His "fruit and utility" to us so that the eyes of our mind "effectively touch" Him.⁽⁴⁾ It

-
1. ut Christus de coelo veniat suo spiritu - Def. 6. The context is Martyr's use of the Liturgy of Basil and Chrysostom, which Gardiner had asserted as involving adoration in the Eucharist.
 2. see Chapter 9.
 3. e.g. in I Cor. 4.8: just as in hope we share the future perfection, so "It is proper to faith to grasp things absent as though present".
 4. Dial. 130.

is this new way of using the word substantia that sets the Reformer over against the cavils of both sides of the contemporary Eucharistic debate.⁽¹⁾ This concept is represented by his particular use of the word virtus, which he prefers as allowing him to contrast this with the Romanist restriction of substantia to a corporeal-physical reality. In illustration, he brings the simile of a King on his throne:

And the power of the King goes out to all parts of the Kingdom, though the King himself does not come to these parts. (Def. 804)

Thus, he concludes, may the "virtue" of a thing be more extensive than its "substance" or "nature". In the sacrament we communicate with this virtue - we may even say that

bread is converted into the virtue of the body of Christ. (Def. 807)

The power of faith demonstrates two things in the sacrament: that Christ is in heaven, and that by His Spirit and grace and the celebration of His memory, he is present with us on earth.⁽²⁾ The two concepts of ascent and descent are thus brought together in relation to the dynamic of faith.

We ascend in our minds through faith into heaven and there feed on Him. Yet sacramentally, just as in a sign and a figure, the body and blood of Christ are in the bread and wine, and in the same way as in the water of Baptism. But the body of Christ is in those who rightly receive the bread and wine of the Eucharist in much greater perfection than if He were present in them corporeally: for this way would profit them not. But when He is in them spiritually through the divine power, He gives them eternal life. (Def. 785)

The progress of his thought may be summed up as follows. First he interprets

-
1. Yet this is not so distinctive of Martyr as it is of Calvin: Martyr, in general, debates about substantia on the ground of the scholastic philosophy, and uses rather such terms as virtus, vis, potestas to convey his meaning. His terminology (especially his use of signum and spiritualiter) was often misunderstood, even by his close friend Bucer. See App. D.
 2. Def. 631.

faith as a union with Christ in which the flesh of Christ is not "substantially" joined with us - that would mean we were made one hypostasis! ⁽¹⁾ - but is present to faith:

We constantly acknowledge Christ to be with the faithful by grace, Spirit and in respect of His divinity: yea indeed we do not deny His flesh to be present as a presence of faith. (Def. 22)

He then compares this presence by the Holy Spirit and faith ⁽²⁾ with the corporeal presence of his adversaries, and concludes that the latter cannot "bring any other profit" than is had by the spiritual reception. ⁽³⁾ He sums up the comparison in one place very compactly:

First, the distance of places prevents (the corporeal eating); next, the blessed nature of His body would not allow it; finally that kind of contact affords no sort of utility ... But by the hand of the heart you take the very body of the Lord to yourself: and by an inward outpouring you drink His blood. (Def. 475)

Finally, he goes on to declare that the corporeal presence is no presence and therefore is an absolute denial of the presence of the Body of Christ and of union with Him!

O wretches! For you have not the body of Christ, but a piece of bread and a cup of wine: this you adore as Christ: this you eat as being the flesh and blood of the Lord. (Def. 79)

The positive teaching in this context is the nourishing quality of the new humanity of Christ, for this is what virtus signifies. The communication must be in order to our union with Christ. This is the reality of union with Christ, and the analogy from which Martyr meets all his opponents. The sacrament of communication is sign and seal of the nourishment of the Body of Christ.

1. Def. 287

2. cf. in Rom. 8.2: "By this we see what is to be understood by the law of the Spirit of life, namely the Holy Spirit or else faith. For either is true: for indeed the Author of our deliverance is the Spirit of Christ; and the instrument which He uses to save us is faith".

3. Epit. 2.10.

The Nourishment of the Body of Christ.

I affirm that (the body and blood of Christ) are truly given and offered unto us both by words and by signs, when they are greatly and most effectually signified by them. And also in communicating, we truly receive the same things, when with a full and perfect consent of faith we embrace those things which are delivered by the signification of the words and signs. Therefore it happens that we are most closely joined together with Christ: and Whom we have obtained in Baptism by the benefit of regeneration, Him we more and more still put on by the sacrament of the Supper: since nature provides that we are nourished by the same things of which we consist. And if we mean to be saved, we must take care that Christ dwell in us and we in Him until we are wholly converted into Him, and so converted that there should remain nothing of our own, of death I mean, which was born along with us, of corruption and sin.
(Tract., Praef.)

There is a nourishment of faith in the Eucharist: by the means of grace human faith is increased. But for Peter Martyr this increase has reference to the growth of Christ in us. In a letter to his unknown friend, ⁽¹⁾ Martyr treats this doctrine at great length, because this man disagreed with Martyr on this point, holding that although faith is increased, the union with Christ is an absolute and constant state. Martyr cites Ephesians 3.19, 1.23 and 4.11-14 -

unto the faithful it belongs daily to be fulfilled and perfected (impleri et perfici). But the same Apostle declares that it is Christ alone by whom we are filled and perfected, indeed it is He who is both filled and perfected in us ... While one member of this body is augmented, Christ may be said to be increased in it, that is becomes greater and nearer to it ... Nor is there any other increase of the members to be considered than that Christ Himself should be amplified and enlarged in each of His members: and this is done if the faithful are daily made the more partakers of Him.

Christ does not communicate, by the "joints and fastenings" or means of grace, something other than Himself, a quasi-physical "grace" for example, or a knowledge by which faith subjectively increases itself. What the Head communicates to His members is ... the Head! The Christian is daily more and more "a partaker of the Head". Since faith means union with Christ, an increase of faith

1. amico cuidam, L.C. 1105-1108; no place or date is given.

means an increase in that union. The two are inseparably joined, and Christ appointed faith to this end, that "by its increase we apprehend Christ more and more". It is a "mean or instrument" to this apprehension.

This instrumentality of faith is not derived from the elements or operi operato. But just as faith is aroused and made warm and increased (nostra fides excitatur, incalescit et augetur) when we hear the holy words, so when we receive the visible words or Sacraments, our faith "is made firmer and grows". And the benefit of this increase of faith is a fuller incorporation into Christ. This "follows upon the sealing" and is not simply identifiable with the sealing. The sealing, it appears, is a means to increase faith; the increase of faith is a means to the growth of Christ in us.

By this light and brightness added by the sealing, the mind is stirred up to believe the more, and by the more it believes, Christ is more earnestly apprehended, and He both comes and cleaves closer to him. (illique propior et accedit et adhaeret)

In closing this letter, Martyr assures the correspondent that he will not love or honour him less on account of "this diversity of opinion, which is not great".

The principle here set forth is elsewhere affirmed, especially in relation to the fact that the key to the action of the Eucharist is the analogy of nourishment. It is the nature of faith, Martyr states, ⁽¹⁾ never to be perfect in this life, but always becoming more perfect and increased (perfectius et cumulatius). The Sacrament therefore seals the grace given before.

But it is known that a human body is fed and nourished by the very substance and nature of bread, but not by its appearances or accidents. And therefore this most suitably and aptly signifies the body of Christ which suffered for us on the Cross. For that, apprehended by faith, feeds us and nourishes us spiritually: since between the body of Christ and the nature of bread there is a common analogy in nourishing. For in the one the nourishment is physical, in the other spiritual. (Def. 739)

1. Def. 738.

Christ, as the Head of every believer, is the source of life and the Spirit, which flow from the divinity, as by the flesh and blood of Christ given unto death, these are derived unto us. (Conf. Argent. 1556)

The divinity of Christ is the source of our life and union, but not apart from the humanity - it is, in fact, this crucified and risen humanity which is the nourishment:

For His body given to the Cross, which is grasped by us by a true faith, is our bread, which feeds us unto life eternal. (Def. 94)

Christ gives bread twice: once on the Cross, to which He refers in John 6; and again in the Supper, when the same flesh is set forth to those eating in faith, the signs of bread and wine being added. (1)

There are two things to be noted in this concept of the nourishment of the Body of Christ. First, it is to the Death of Christ as the past event of redemption, that faith looks for its substance. Second, the significance and efficacy of that Death is both signified and sealed to faith according to a specific analogy, that of nourishment, in the signs of bread and wine. This involves other analogies, notably two: one related to the joy which wine especially gives, (2) and one related to the unity of the bread and wine as one made out of many (grains and grapes). But in the main this is the governing analogy:

In the holy Supper not only is faith required, by which we place our trust in the death of the Lord, but also outward symbols are added, by which the faith of the communicants is called forth, and which show what the spiritual manducation of the body of Christ confers: namely what, as appropriate to bread in food and wine in drink, is accustomed to guarantee the life of the eaters and drinkers. (vitae comedentium et bibentium praestare solent). (Def. 94)

1. Def. 95.

2. e.g. Disp. III, vs. Morg: the analogy in the sacrament is not the breaking so much as the enjoyment of the meat; Def. 365: grapes not only nourish and strengthen but gladden (exhilarantur).

It is the historical Passion and Death which should be "before our eyes while we communicate,"⁽¹⁾ for indeed this is what 'eating His flesh' means, to believe that these were given for our salvation.⁽²⁾

To eat the flesh of Christ is nothing else than to apprehend by faith that He was given for us as the price of our redemption ... we communicate now in the passion of Christ, if we embrace it by a living and effective faith. (Def. 545)

Inasmuch as the body and blood of the Lord are given for our salvation, when grasped by us with effectual and ardent faith they are for soul and mind salutary food and drink, by which we are repeatedly refreshed and recreated unto eternal life ... such a familiar symbol of nourishment cannot be found more fitting than bread. For by it the body is daily refreshed and renewed. (Dial. 135f)

Thus Martyr says "any kind of faith" is not this eating,

but only that by which we apprehend our Lord, as once dead and crucified for us. (Def. 518)

For the spiritual presence is of the same kind as His death - and as "the good things of the life to come" on which our hope is fixed.⁽³⁾ The Creed should be publicly recited before Communion, since it contains the Death of Christ, with what preceded and followed.⁽⁴⁾ The two elements are to be used as follows:

From the one part, the faith of the communicants grasps the body of Christ nailed on the Cross for our salvation, whence we are spiritually fed. The same faith apprehends from the other part His blood, shed for our salvation, and here we are spiritually watered and we drink. While communicating, the mind of the faithful is occupied chiefly about these mysteries of the death of Christ. (An in Comm. Lic. 10)

This orientation to the Death of Christ has an interesting implication.

As often as we fully believe that Christ is crucified for us, we eat His flesh, which metaphorically is called bread. (Disp. IV, vs. Ghed.)

Therefore Martyr can say to abstainers from wine:

-
1. Disp. IV, vs. Ghed.
 2. Epit., Sent. 3: he adds that to that flesh and blood are joined the things Christ removed on the Cross.
 3. Epit., Sent. 17.
 4. in I Cor. 11.26.

if a man cannot receive the Sacrament as instituted by Christ, let him abstain, for if he desire it and believe, no commodity or fruit shall in that respect be lacking to him; just as to him that desires Baptism, if he have no opportunity for it, it is imputed as if he had received it.
(An in Comm. Lic. 22)

Briefly, "to drink is to believe", (1) since in the Sacrament itself it is still a spiritual eating, "to the soul and faith". (2) Once again we must recall the true effect of the Sacrament.

But it is not joined to the thing itself, and corporeally: but is a sign or sacrament or memorial related to the thing indicated: or as an instrument with effect. Because these symbols are not only signs of the body and blood of Christ, but also instruments which the Holy Spirit uses to feed us spiritually with the body and blood of the Lord. (Def. 82)

And whereas you object that the receiving of the body of Christ by faith can be had without the sacrament, I grant it: for both with the symbols and without the symbols are we truly made partakers of Him, while we recall to mind Christ crucified for us, and His blood shed for us, and so believe. But when the symbols are adjoined, which the Holy Spirit uses as instruments to better imprint faith in our minds, we are helped a great deal. For in regard to divine things we are slower, and therefore need outward symbols. (Disp. III, final speech)

The Sacrament is an instrument to arouse faith, not a cause which confers it. (3)
Faith has as its object the Death of Christ and as its content union with Christ: believing means eating His flesh and drinking His blood. Sacraments are instruments by which this is "performed more effectively" since such symbols "move us more earnestly" than words alone. (4) But most significantly, Martyr is not advancing a doctrine that the Eucharist means the communication of ideas (about the Lord's death), or even a "benefit" impersonally conceived, but Christ Himself.

If you ask, what do we obtain through Communion? some would reply,

-
1. Def. 146.
 2. Tract. 58 - cf. in Iud. 13.25, His flesh and blood "are an invisible nourishment".
 3. De Poenit. 10.
 4. Tract. 33.

the merit and fruit of the Lord's death, which is not displeasing to me. But I add, that we have also the Lord Himself, Who is the Fountain of these goods. (in I Cor. 11.24)

The analogy of nourishment is continually emphasized by Martyr in treating of the Eucharist. Because of the analogy, transubstantiation, the withholding of the cup from the laity, and neglect of the sacrament are denied. This is the meaning or content of the Sacrament.

Thus God acted in the Sacraments, which are names and visible words by which He effectively portrayed His promises. For He took care that the properties of the signs should agree as much as possible with the things designated. (in I Cor. 10.3)

Those who acknowledge a nutrition of our body from the Eucharist, which comes through true bread, obtain from this the ratio of the sacrament. For, as the body of Christ feeds the soul, so bread feeds the body. Who therefore remove the grains and composition of the grains, and take away the substance of the bread, are in my judgment Sacramentarii, because they remove the ratio and analogy of the sacrament. (Def. 403)

Moreover, Martyr makes very clear that the analogy in the Sacrament is not a merely formal progression from signs to signification, but derives from the prior revelation of the Person of Christ as spiritual nutrition, to which are added fitting signs. The nutritional reference of the signs is not the origin of "the power of analogy and beginning of the comparison,"⁽¹⁾ for this rests with "the spiritual nutrition of the body of Christ":

For in mysteries, the things that are signified hold the better place, and should be altogether preferred to the signs and symbols. For as the ratio nutritionis makes clear, it is not the sense of the argument by which our body is restored by bread. But for this reason it is proved of necessity that bread is retained in the Eucharist, so that the power of nourishing, as it were, should be in the symbols just as it is in the body of the Lord, which is signified. (Def. 404)

-
1. vis analogiae et initium collationis - Def. 404. This whole section (Obj. 135, pp 403-407) is particularly significant for this aspect of Martyr's analogical thinking.

Martyr uses this direction of the analogical movement to prove the presence of true bread and wine in the Eucharist, ⁽¹⁾ but it is equally useful at this point to recall his fundamental basis for theological analogy, the accommodation of Christ in His own Person as the divine Analogue.

Martyr notes two analogies operative in the relation of bread to the Body of Christ. ⁽²⁾ One is, that for the Hebrews bread stands for "all kinds of food". John 6, for instance, cannot be understood apart from this trope of bread as food in general: Christ was to give His flesh to be "like bread" (instar panis), like "spiritual food for the soul".

That bread of which John writes signifies the body of Christ or His flesh. Nor is anything else taught by that word than that metaphorically His own flesh, when eaten in faith by believers, will be like bread, that is real food by which they are quickened unto eternal life ... Therefore Christ was eager to recall them by His doctrine from the food of the body to the nourishment of the soul.
(Def. 53, 59).

This is the primary reference, to the nourishing quality of the Body of Christ, and it is to be consciously operative in the reception of the elements:

But as for the words 'Take ye and eat ye', I say that they must be understood thus: As you receive this bread and eat it with your body, so receive you My body by faith, and with the mind, that you may be strengthened thereby in place of meat. (Disp. III, vs Marg.)

as with the body you eat bread, so with the mind you may feed upon My flesh. (Tract. 34)

The metaphor is this, that just as bread naturally nourishes and sustains us, so the flesh of Christ being eaten spiritually and by faith, sustains us in respect of both soul and body ... that sacramental bread was the flesh of Christ, to be given unto death for our salvation ... He expresses a metaphorical name for His flesh, because He should be to us for bread, or like bread, of

-
1. cf. Def. 463: "If you remove wine from the cup, the blood of Christ cannot be shown and signified by sacramental analogy" (sacramentali analogia ostendi et significari).
 2. Def. 151f.

whose property He would admonish us, to understand that the flesh of Christ is bread allegorically. (Disp. IV, vs Ched.)

Because of this analogy, which leads us to the heart of Christ's work in us, Martyr calls the Eucharist "our defence and shelter"⁽¹⁾ because it fortifies us against the enemy. How does Christ sustain His Church?

Since wars and temptations are imminent, He supplies armour, namely the Word of God; and with the meat of the Eucharist He confirms and strengthens them to the battle. (in I Cor. 4.1)

The second analogy is a favourite one in Patristic thought. The Fathers called bread panis triticeus, wheaten bread:

that kind of bread which consists of many grains of wheat, and by that signifies the union we should have among ourselves and with Christ. (Def. 152)

The Sacrament excites faith in us, by which the Spirit is drawn to us more copiously, and we are united in the mystical body more and more: thus the analogy of the "many grains" and "many grapes" signifies the mutual union among believers as well as with Christ.⁽²⁾

And as regards the mystical body, the similitude lies in this, that just as bread and wine consist of much gathering and pressing together, that is of many grains of corn and of many grapes, so the mystical body consists of many members, who grow up together into one. (Disp. II, beginning)

The resolution of this analogical movement of the Sacrament lies in the doctrine of the sursum corda.

I judge the real and substantial body of Christ to be only in the heavens, yet the faithful truly receive, spiritually and through faith, the communication of His true body and His true blood, which were delivered to the Cross for our sake. (Sent. in Coll. Poiss.)

In this context Martyr explains that since faith is not directed to a fictitious

1. munitio et protectio - Def. 731.

2. Def. 505.

object, a phantasma, the Body received spiritually must be identical with that Body which suffered on the Cross. How can this be? Simply because "distance of places" nothing hinders, inasmuch as the Lord's Supper is a heavenly matter. (1)

We have already noted that this way of speaking must be related to Martyr's doctrine of the dynamic presence of Christ as virtus; yet in regard to the analogical content of the Eucharist this "being lifted up" is his normal concept.

In the celebration of the Supper the ancients used to say, Sursum corda, desiring the souls of men to be carried to heaven, but not to remain fixed to the outward elements. It therefore appears that they never thought of a real presence of the body of Christ to which the souls were rather to be turned downwards. (Def. 195)

For there you must not think either of the bread or the wine - your mind and sense must cleave only to the things represented unto you. Therefore it is said 'Lift up your hearts', when you lift up your mind from the signs to the invisible things offered you. (Tract. 44)

When the faithful receive the sacrament, their mind is lifted up to heaven itself, this is the motion of their faith. (2)

For the faithful mount up like eagles to heaven itself, through faith; and there by mind and spirit experience the full enjoyment of the Lord, and grasp His body given for them on the Cross, with great profit. (in I Cor. 11.24)

The Renewal of the Body.

The elements ...nourish unto eternal health, since they are instruments of the Holy Spirit to excite faith in our souls, through which the gifts of renewal (dona renovationis) are transfused to our body and flesh. (Def. 427)

A final aspect of Peter Martyr's sacramental doctrine must be noted here: the Patristic idea that the grace received in the Eucharist redounds also to the very body of the believer.

-
1. See App. E for the Poissy statement. of. Dial. 130D: "The Lord's Supper is a thing heavenly and spiritual, not human and carnal".
 2. De Vot. 1529B.

Our bodies are in a certain way nourished and restored to eternal life by the body and blood of Christ. (Epit., Sent. 10)

This is not based upon a semi-physical idea of grace, for Martyr gives it a definite place within his doctrine of union with Christ and the communication of His new humanity to His mystical Body.

we understand our union with Christ to extend not only to spirit and soul, but also to body and flesh. Whence no wonder the old Fathers said, In the Lord's Supper not only is our soul and spirit quickened (vegetari) by the flesh and blood of Christ, but also our body and flesh are fed from thence, so that they are restored more fit and firm to the use of good works, by which Christ is served. (in I Cor. 6.15)

Beside this idea that the body is strengthened to do good works, and so grow in the "second righteousness" of sanctification, is placed the controlling idea that the renewal of the body effected in this life is simply the beginning of eternal life according to which our bodies become "capable of immortality".⁽¹⁾ The properties we receive belong unto the resurrection power of the new humanity, in which the whole man participates.

Martyr speaks of this concept in terms of a "twofold bodily nourishment" received in the Eucharist.⁽²⁾ The signs feed our body; the spiritual nourishment of the Body of Christ redounds to renew our bodies themselves unto eternal life, to make them capable of immortality and resurrection.

There come to us by this sacrament two kinds of nourishment. One is natural, namely by the nature of the symbols, bread and wine, by which the human body is usually sustained. To this kind of nourishment, though it is not to be condemned, yet Irenaeus and other Fathers attribute little. The other nourishment is, that while we receive the sacrament, we embrace the body and blood of Christ by soul and faith, and there is our mind first filled with the Spirit and with grace, next our body is renewed, that it may daily become a fit organ and instrument for the Spirit, and so made more capable of the blessed resurrection. (Disp. III. 2)

-
1. in I Cor. 10.16 - this is the best section on this theme.
 2. e.g. Tract. 43.

This difficult thought is expressed by the Fathers in language that often suggests an identity between this present capability and the future state of the resurrected body, or present state of Christ's body. Of the difficulties involved, Martyr is well aware, and seeks to guard against confusion. Writing of Irenaeus and Justinian, who say that after receiving the Eucharist our bodies are no longer mortal, because the Sacrament has become in the body a preserver unto everlasting life, he states:

If these things are understood properly and absolutely, as they seem at first sight, as if they taught that the body and blood of Christ pass into the true nourishment of bodies and so there is in them the beginning of resurrection, the opinion would be terribly absurd ... the body of Christ, being impassible, cannot be changed into other bodies ... let us understand that in the Lord's Supper the faithful receive bread and wine with the mouth of the body, and with their mind and spirit receive the body and blood of Christ, even in the way He was given on the Cross for our salvation: and in that receiving of these things by faith, we are justified and regenerated, or we are confirmed in righteousness and spiritual birth. But justification and regeneration, which are in the mind, make the body itself capable of resurrection. And in this way we may say that the outward elements we receive with our body are a preparation to resurrection - because they are instruments of the Holy Spirit, by which He stirs up faith in us, which is rightly the origin (principium) of resurrection. (De Resurr. 63)

We may conclude that whatever effect the Eucharist has on our body is strictly related to the eschatological nature of faith: justification means the beginning of resurrection, "the beginnings of our blessed immortality".⁽¹⁾ It is for this reason - because of his doctrine of faith as union with Christ and therefore of justification as the forming of Christ in us, and of sanctification as the dynamic growth in us of the Risen Man - that Martyr accepts the Patristic notion of the present renewal of our bodies as relating to the ontological content of faith, the "beyond" of our union with Christ, which will not begin with

1. Letter Ad amicum quendam ... de causa Eucharistiae, L.C. 1144ff, in the latter part of which he states the case in almost identical language with the De. Resurr.

resurrection but will be then unveiled. The full nourishment of the Body of Christ involves an area of life not sufficiently indicated by the terms "by mind and soul"; for Christ renews the whole man, his body and his flesh as well.

PART III.

REAL PRESENCE AND TRUE SACRIFICE.

CHAPTER VII : THE EUCHARIST AND TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

... all arguments return to the extreme, to that absurd and idiotic thicket, Transubstantiation. For out of that rotten flesh, the refined conceit for us Adorations, Oblations, Reservations, Concomitances, Distentions of the body of Christ, Traffickings of Masses, Individua vaga, Accidents without subject, and infinitely more marvels and disagreeable dishes. (Def., Praef.)

Peter Martyr had begun to depart from the doctrine of Transubstantiation as early as his years at Lucca; when he left Italy for the cause of Reformation, his first written work, on the Creed, included a significant aside, about

a full treatise of the sacraments, which I hope to perform shortly, if the Lord lend me life. (Catech. 42)

That was 1544; in 1549 he produced the Treatise, along with his notes of the famous Oxford Disputation, provoked by Richard Smith. Ten years later, writing against another Englishman, Stephen Gardiner, he enlarged the teaching and scope of the Treatise in his 'Defence of the ancient and Apostolic Doctrine concerning the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist', his most fruitful and detailed work on any subject, and probably the greatest single work on the Eucharist of the entire Reformation. (1)

From these works we derive a twofold attack upon the doctrine of transubstantiation, which we may denote as a philosophical and a theological refutation. Martyr declares that the doctrine can be disproved on its own terms, chiefly with

-
1. The book is directed to Gardiner's Confutatio cavillationum ... ab impiis Capernaitis, written against Crammer, Martyr, etc. under the pseudonym M. Anton. Constantius; it has a most optimistic plan, attempting to give the teaching of the sacred writings, the ancient Fathers, and acts of the Councils, de tota Eucharistiae causa, as the note to the Reader on the title-page has it. The Tractatio is most excellent in its own right, and sections 2-5 sum up the Romanist arguments for transubstantiation. Martyr also wrote the Epitome or Analysis, in 1561, a brief summary intended to be like "the sure sight of the lodestar" in the storm of controversy.

reference to the scholastic principle concerning accidents remaining without their subject, accidentia manere sine subiecto. But from this position he always moves to the positive theological argument, the sacramental analogy which we have submitted as the centre of gravity of his doctrine. Both levels of argument deserve close attention at their crucial points.

A. THE PHILOSOPHICAL REFUTATION.

Dialectics is a noble gift of God: nor is there any other art of more value to the refutation of error. (Def. 377)

Substance and Accidents.

Transubstantiation, as the name implies, means the substitution of one substance for another - in the case of the Eucharist, of the Body of Christ for that of the bread and the wine. Gardiner had accepted the medieval conception of substantia as prior to accidents and able to exist without them, and claimed that this was a clear teaching of Aristotle. ⁽¹⁾ This was the usual Romanist argument, that the "substance" of bread and wine was changed into that of the body and blood of Christ through the miraculous consecration of the priestly office. But Peter Martyr takes this to its source in Aristotle and points out that this is not what he said, but is a "new philosophy". What Aristotle taught was a distinction between accidents separable and inseparable from their substance or subject: accidentia separabilia et inseparabilia. Certain substances (of God and angels, for example) are without weight and quantity; but outside this class substance is not separable from its accidents - the human body, for example,

1. Def., Obj. 11, pp 36-40; cf. Obj. 10 for this discussion.

as corporeal substance, cannot exist without locus. Moreover, to say that substance exists prior to its accidents (prius esse posse absque posteriore) refers only to the idea (notitia) and not to the thing itself (res ipsa, existentia).

Our indication of Martyr's doctrine of real presence as virtus has introduced us to his dynamic concept of substance, deriving from his acceptance of the Person of Christ as the architectonic of his theology. But he is quite willing to meet the Romanists on their own scholastic ground, since he is confident that it is a logical impossibility - even Lombard denied that accidents can remain without a substance, without a sustaining subject. ⁽¹⁾ For this is a philosophical problem, and for philosophy the senses must be presupposed as trustworthy. ⁽²⁾ Apart from this basic philosophical presupposition as to the nature of the substance-accident relation, you have only a "despotism of accidents"! ⁽³⁾

Moreover, by this unnecessary transubstantiation, they pervert the nature of things, since they pluck away accidents from their substance and proper subject, which is far more than to separate substance from a quantity ... since an accident is a latter thing than substance.
(Disp. IV, conf. 1.4)

Two arguments of Martyr's concerning the problem of substance may be introduced at this point. One concerns the term "nature" and the other, "action" or "relation". The Fathers often speak of a change in the natura of bread and wine in the Sacrament. Martyr agrees with them: the nature of the elements is changed indeed. But natura in this case means "property or condition", not "substance". ⁽⁴⁾ The Fathers do not claim that nature as substance is changed, but only as property or quality. This view Martyr himself strongly upheld

-
1. Def. 251.
 2. Def. 249.
 3. regnum quoddam accidentium - Def. 528.
 4. Tract. 45, Def. 235.

against Tropism. (1) His principle in interpreting the Fathers is:

Wherever the Fathers say 'the nature of bread is changed', it is to be received as nature in respect of properties, as in Cyprian; but wherever they say 'the nature is not changed', that nature is to be received in respect of substance, as in Gelasius. (Def. 640)

Transubstantiation overthrows the categories of being - for instance, the familiar cavil that mice may feed or worms breed on the accidents of the Host implies that these are really turned into substance! (2) And a first principle of Dialectics is overthrown when they demand a presence of the Body of Christ non quantum. (3)

This latter argument requires further investigation.

In the context of the philosophical problem of substance and nature, Martyr introduces the argument from the nature of a human body.

And this is in opposition, for a human body to be a quantum, and to have distinct members in itself, and the same to be diffused over diverse and many places, and almost infinite: to be present, and not to be in a place. (Def. 42)

one and the same body of Christ does not sustain at one and the same time such contrary qualities as passible and impassible. (Disp. II.2)

This argument serves against consubstantiation as well, and receives from that side the same reply that Gardiner gives:

For whatever is most certainly objected by us about the true human nature in Christ, all that he hoped to be able to confute by one little word, if he said 'God is omnipotent' and the body is not in the Eucharist except invisibly. (Def., Praef.)

Certain aspects of this argument will concern us below, but in general Martyr's position is this. Against the plea that the divine omnipotence is able to

1. see below on 'The Words of Consecration'. It is unfortunate that Martyr did not relate his discussion of these terms to Boethius' Persona est individua substantia rationalis naturae, which he uses (Dial. 17F) only as an argument of Fantachus, to which Orothetes (who agrees with the definition!) replies that we cannot descend below the persona to divide the Two Natures in Christ.
2. Def. 257ff.
3. magnitudinem etsi posterior sit substantia corporata, tamen ab illa seiungi non posse, nisi prorsus corrumpatur. - Def. 260.

effect logical absurdities, acceptable to faith, Martyr grants that God is doubtless omnipotent, indeed his doctrine of providence is one of the consistent and striking aspects of his theology - but God does not overrule things contrary by nature. (1) The Body of Christ must be accepted as a quantum, whereas transubstantiation has it replace the substance of bread without occupying place. It is infinite, divinized flesh: the Docetic heresy is operative here.

It is a perilous matter to delude the senses by transubstantiation; because the proof of the true resurrection of Christ then perishes ... the Marcionite heretics would soon have said that Christ had no true human body, but only its accidents and figure, as you say of bread ... Also the Fathers thought that they effectively proved Christ to be true man, by His human affections and properties, which Scripture shows ... These arguments could be denied by the example of your transubstantiation, and the heretics could say, Just as this does not follow, namely There are properties of bread and wine in the sacrament of the Eucharist, therefore the substance of bread and wine is truly there: so, it does not follow, In Christ there were properties and affections of a man, therefore He had a most true human substance. And thus shall there be opened a window to most grievous errors. (Disp. IV, conf. 1.3)

The second concept to which Martyr relates the argument about substance is the Eucharist as actio. Both Romanist and Lutheran are enmeshed in categories of the second causes of philosophy. Thus both fail to rise above the static relationships of logic to a regard for the office of the Holy Spirit. Martyr, however, points out that the "mystery" is not what the elements are, but what they signify. (2) For although in logic the correlative of "sign" may be "thing signified", that is, a substance, yet in all sacraments is it not Christ Himself Who is the res? (3) Consider the Last Supper itself:

1. e.g. Potentia Dei ad ea non extenditur quae contradictionem implicant - Def. 34; for Transub. cf. Def. 41ff, and for Consub. Dial. 6-7, etc., and our next Chapter: also in I Cor. 11.24, where Martyr points out that the question is not God's posse but His velle, which is revealed in the promises of Scripture.
2. Def., Obj. 8: Gardiner had said that Christ was in the Eucharist non ut in loco, sed ut in sacramento, iuxta mysterii conditionem. Martyr replies: He is not contained in a little box on the altar, nor under accidents of bread and wine, sed sursum.
3. in I Cor. 10.3.

Never do we read that when Christ was on earth He exhorted the Apostles to seek Him elsewhere than where He was present with them. I am persuaded that when the Apostles heard the Lord in the Supper say of bread, 'This is My body', they fixed their eyes not on the bread but on Christ Himself. (Def. 508)

But if the matter or substance of this sacrament is Christ Himself, static categories cannot hold the relationship, which must be personal and dynamic. This is exactly what Martyr insists upon: the dramatic action according to which the sacramental analogy operates as the Holy Spirit uses His instruments. The whole Sacrament, he states, is actio: remove that, and you have no more Sacrament - whereas transubstantiation retains a sacrament in the element as such, even after communicating! Only communion can satisfy the Lord's institution, yet this is precisely what transubstantiation prevents, since Christ is in the element and the sacrificers are not stirred up to communion with Him. (1) The Eucharist may be briefly defined: it is "action or relation". (2) If you disjoin 'This is My body' from 'Take and eat', you remove both Body and Sacrament. (3)

The end of the Sacrament of the Eucharist is that it should be eaten and drunk: since, as you yourself know, outside of use there is no sacrament (extra usum non sit sacramentum); nor can you prove otherwise by holy Scripture. (De Vot. 1529G)

The whole Eucharist is founded on action: outside of that not even its name can be retained. (in II Sem. 6.5)

The promise of communication in the Sacrament applies only "while we eat and drink", for all the words and deeds together make the Sacrament. (4)

But we know that the sacrament then is, when we do those things that Christ did and commanded to be done: but He not only spoke those words, but also gave thanks, broke bread, ate and extended it for others to eat. And whereas there are many things here, all concur with the truth of the sacrament, nor must any of these things be omitted. (Tract. 11)

-
1. Tract. 19 - see Chapter 10.
 2. in I Cor. 10.16.
 3. in I Cor. 11.24.
 4. Disp. III, vs. Morg.; Tract. 51.

Once again we face the problem of analogical relation, and this in turn forms the transition from the philosophical level to the decisive theological refutation.

The Relation of Relatives.

.. relatives consist in two things, as the Dialecticians say, fundamentum and terminus ... such is their conjunction that one cannot be understood, be defined or exist without the other. Wherefore, since the sacrament of the Eucharist is a certain relation, it is necessary to establish the fundamentum, doubtless the signifying thing, that is the bread: and the terminus, that is the thing signified, which clearly is the body of Christ. But although these are so joined between themselves that the one carries the other, the nature of a Sacrament cannot remain firm, nor yet is it necessary that they should be one by local conjunction or by any contact. For they can be so joined although separated by the farthest spaces of places. (Def. 386)

The philosophical refutation involves the question about the relation between the two terms of any Sacrament. This is my body: what kind of proposition is this? Martyr begins⁽¹⁾ from its historical setting and replies: either literal (a proposition of identity) or tropical (figurative). The former is out of the question, since that would mean 'The bread, which Christ took in hand, was His body'. For we are dealing here with disparates or relatives, which can be predicated of one another only by a certain figuration or signification. The bread therefore "is a figure of His body, or signifies His body".

Gardiner denies that this is a question of disparates. He admits corpus as disparate but holds that Hoc is pronominal, referring to that of which the disparate is predicated. Martyr comments:

O elegant Dialectician! If the word corpus is, as you concede, disparate, from what I pray thee, is it disparate? ... it remains that the word in this proposition is disparate from itself! (Def. 45)

1. Def. 44ff.

Gardiner has done what Martyr dismissed as impossible, namely, making this a proposition of identity and adducing as his examples the propositions Vinum est vinum, mel est mel, lac est lac.⁽¹⁾ But such examples are "barren and irrelevant" since the two terms in question "pertain to different kinds or species" and are therefore true disparates, such as homo est equus, and not vinum est vinum. The issue is that relationship between bread (to which Hoc refers) and corpus. Christ held bread in His hand, and the Apostles' "common sense" perceived it to be bread. Therefore this is not the grammatical question of the relation between subject and predicate (Gardiner claimed that the predicate explained what the subject demonstrated) but the philosophical question of the relation between disparates. We have already shown the answer to this question to be the Aristotelian relation of analogy as the proportional mean between univocity and pure equivocity.

Martyr's argument is simply that by definition a sacrament involves us in the question of relativa, of which the one cannot be understood without the other.⁽²⁾ To identify the terms destroys their nature, and "removes all the ratio" from the Sacrament.⁽³⁾ In such identification a stalemate is reached, since the Sacrament is reduced to one ambiguous term.

you admit an equivocation, because for metaphorical bread you always oppose to me the bread given by Christ in the Supper, which was true and natural, and a sign of this allegorical bread, that is of the flesh of Christ. (Disp. IV, vs. Ched.)

The words of the Supper must be understood tropically - this is Martyr's summary

-
1. cf. Def. 130: Ego sum panis, which by simple inversion yields Panis est idem quod ego!
 2. Def. 462.
 3. Def. 22.

of his position. ⁽¹⁾ A figurative speech in the Supper (Hoc est corpus meum) is demanded by Scripture, by the nature of a Sacrament, and by the witness of the Fathers. ⁽²⁾ Thus comparing Scripture with Scripture, we must interpret Matthew and Mark by the figurative speech of Paul and Luke; ⁽³⁾ Ezekiel 37.11 uses the verb substantive 'is' for 'it signifies'; ⁽⁴⁾ indeed there are frequent tropical speeches in Scripture: John Baptist is Elias, Christ's words are Spirit and life, the Gospel is the power of God, Circumcision is the covenant, the blood is the life, God is a consuming fire! ⁽⁵⁾ Proving a figurative speech from the nature of a sacrament is self-evident, as the definition 'the sign of a sacred thing' shows. A distinction must be retained between the two terms - there must be two relatives extant, with some difference between them. ⁽⁶⁾ As to the Fathers, does not Augustine say "sign", "figure", "mystery"? Or Jerome, "represent", Tertullian, "figure", Cyprian, "signify"? ⁽⁷⁾ Therefore:

In many places of holy Scripture Est is taken for significat ... by the antecedents, consequents and historical circumstances of the Lord's Supper; by the truth of the human nature which was in Christ; by the sixth chapter of John; and by the nature of sacraments, it is firmly proved that the word 'is' ought to be taken there for 'signifies'.
(De Vot. 1440)

-
1. in the Epitome. The sections are entitled, 'That the words of the Supper are to be understood tropically' and 'That the figurative speech of Christ's words requires no real or substantial presence of His body and blood'. We must remember that Martyr's "trope" is his particular analogical relationship of "likeness of proportion".
 2. Disp. II.1. of Tract. 38 for detailed reasons for taking the proposition as figurative, including this: "We have respect also to the ascension of Christ into heaven, to the true human nature which He took upon Him".
 3. Epit. VII.
 4. De Resurr. 43.
 5. in I Cor. 11.24, Martyr's best and most complete teaching on the Proposition.
 6. Ibid.: he brings out the meaning of analogy clearly here, as to likeness and the difference that must be kept.
 7. Ibid.

I say that you have not proved, nor can prove that all propositions which consist in the verb substantive (is) must be identical, because some can be predicated of the subject also through a certain analogy or convenience. (Disp. III, vs. Tresh.)

An interesting aspect of this argument about the Proposition of the Supper is Gardiner's introduction of the Scotist concept of individuum vagum to explain his particular type of predication. (1) Martyr has little patience with the doctrine. Scotus gave it to explain the Proposition, teaching that "something singular or individual of a more general substance" is demonstrated. (2) The Hoc refers to this! Christ could hold bread and yet be described as sharing in the substance. No! Martyr says - such a conception can be thought but not held in the hand! Two (sensible) substances cannot be so joined that one is concealed under the other. To speak of an "invisible" mode of presence is not the same as to speak of transubstantiation. To Gardiner's "juggling" Martyr opposes a most apt argument. What of the other proposition in the Eucharist? he asks. 'This cup is the new testament in My blood!': even Gardiner will admit a trope here! (3) For 'cup' is a trope of its contents, which are not some vague abstraction, but true wine. The "things indicated" in the Sacrament are bread and wine.

-
1. Def., Obj. XIV, XV. Martyr calls the concept haec Scotica dogmata, arising in that scholastic sect quae ab tenebris nomen habuit! (p 116). The term is difficult to translate, but conveys the idea of an "indefinite entity". Martyr understands it as representing an ens unum in substantia (p 107), and this suits the context of the discussion of the Proposition quite well. cf. Jewel's 'Apology' III.5 (Parker Soc. ed.) regarding the Romanist debate as to Christ's presence in the Eucharist as quantum or as individuum vagum, etc.
 2. Demonstrari aliquod singulare sive individuum generalioris substantiae - Tract. 13.
 3. Calicem esse vinum - Def. 147.

The reference of Hoc to bread is proved by the common sense of the Disciples who sat at table with Christ. (1) Our senses must remain trustworthy with regard to the forms or signs of revelation: our senses must be retained whole and according to their proper object. (2) The common sense answer must be Augustine's 'What you see is bread', Quod vidistis, panis est. Otherwise -

how much material for error does (transubstantiation) offer to the adherents of Marcion, Valentinus, Eutyches and the other pests who affirm that Christ had not true human flesh? (Def. 110)

Since we have dealt with this argument in Chapter 3, in relation to the signs of revelation, we may pass to a further aspect of the philosophical refutation. That is the literary-grammatical argument from the words of Scripture. (3) Hoc must refer to the substance of bread even after consecration because of texts like I Corinthians 10.16, 'The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?'

Scripture is very clear: Christ took, and gave. What did the Lord take? break? give? You can make no other answer than bread, if you retain the grammatical construction. (Disp. II.1)

our first and chief principle is the holy Scripture, which acknowledges bread to be in that place. (Disp. III, vs. Morg.)

In his commentary on the key verse, I Corinthians 10.16, Martyr derives two arguments. First, bread must remain because Paul states that bread is present as the consecrated element. Second, the element must have a similitude with the thing of which it is the sacrament. Here we pass to the true sacramental-analogical realm of debate, and so to the ultimate theological refutation. (4)

1. Def. 4, 48; cf. 108ff.

2. dum sensibus integris, et sanis, et in suo obiecto versantibus - Def. 248; cf. Obj. 4.

3. cf. esp. in I Cor. 11.24 for arguments from logic and grammar.

4. Cadier therefore (op.cit. p 112) sees the issue in Martyr's Treatise when he says that Martyr's decisive argument is that accidents cannot remain without substance, since this rests on the scholastic notion of substance; but in all Martyr's teaching on the Eucharist this phase of the argument is simply the patient accommodation to childish problems, until he can lead us into the deeper realm of Christological analogy.

B. THE THEOLOGICAL REFUTATION.

We dispute not about the Ideas of Plato, or the Atoms of Democritus, or the Intermundes of Epicurus, or the Enteleches of Aristotle - but about the Body and Blood of the Son of God, by which our redemption is paid in full to the eternal Father, in what manner these are joined with the symbols of the Eucharist. (Def., Praef.)

The Christological Analogy.

Although the analogy of the Person of Christ has been constantly before us, we should note two aspects of it which concern the particular theological refutation of the doctrine of transubstantiation. First, Martyr has proved in terms of the scholastic concepts of substance and accidents, and of the relation between disparates, that the substance of bread must remain. But how can it remain when - as Martyr himself admits - the Body of Christ is "added as a quality" by a sacramental conjunction? Martyr replies, these two "substances" may co-exist on the analogy of the Two Natures in Christ. His particular doctrine of analogy prevents our concluding an identity of proportion from the one to the other; but as an analogue the hypostatic union serves Martyr's purpose admirably.

Here (in Augustine) you see the same comparison between the Eucharist and Christ: it follows from this that just as the two natures remained whole in Christ, so the substance of bread must not be removed from the Eucharist ... I enforce the comparison between Christ Himself and the Eucharist; for the sacrament must correspond to Him: and therefore as in Christ neither of the two natures perished, so in the Eucharist both must remain. (Disp. I.1)

(Gelasius) compares this Sacrament with Christ, in Whom both natures, divine and human, remained whole just as in this Sacrament do the natures of bread and of the body of Christ. (Tract. 31)

By this analogy Martyr proves the possibility of two natures remaining whole together. This is, as it were, the negative Christological analogy. The positive is the main attack upon the Romanist error.

Christ came to join us to Himself, and to this end gives His flesh as spiritual food, particularly through the sacramental analogy of Eucharistic bread and wine. But true bread and wine are exactly what transubstantiation removes from the Sacrament!

The Lord said, The bread which I will give is My flesh, indicating His flesh to be that bread by which He wishes to feed you. How can this be true, if as that fellow teaches, between Christ or His flesh, and bread, there exists no analogy, no likeness, no figure? (Def. 130)

For Gardiner has reduced the relationship to one of identity, making the accidents of bread the figure of the substance of Christ! Thus accidents become a figure of a figure! (1) This figura figurae is the total destruction of the Christological analogy, for it perverts the true analogy, which derives from the side of Christ, the nourishing quality of His new humanity. Gardiner is a Capernaite, carnally minded, and so seeks likeness to Christ in accidents such as form or lineament or roundness. Finding none, he concludes that the accidents must simply be an arbitrary (accidental) physical contact for our grasp of Christ's Body. (2) But Martyr declares that it is the analogy itself which demands the retention of the substance of bread.

When they remove the natures of the elements, the analogy of signification perishes. The bread signifies the body of Christ because it nourishes, strengthens and sustains, which we cannot attribute unto accidents. It is also a signification of many grains gathered into one, which represents the mystical body, and that cannot be attributed unto accidents. (Tract. 11)

we hold here a collation of the substance and properties of bread with the substance and properties of the body of Christ. And indeed we call for nothing else than that this analogy should be retained in that proposition. (Def. 129)

-
1. Def. 63: the accidents of bread are "one figure made a figure of another figure", since accidents are a figure of the Body, and the Body is a figure of Christ's Death.
 2. cf. Def. 130

Christ chose suitable symbols to signify His nourishing and strengthening qualities: but according to the transubstantiators He wholly extinguishes the suitability! ⁽¹⁾

For only substance "corresponds", accidents "neither nourish nor sustain". ⁽²⁾

This is clear from the witness of the Fathers. They asked, why this Sacrament consisted rather of bread and wine than of anything else? Doubtless because their substance consists of many grains of corn and clusters of grapes, and because by these especially are we nourished, strengthened and gladdened. When you exclude the substance and retain accidents alone, you enervate and overthrow these reasons. (Def. 365)

What is "convenient"? is Martyr's question. The Analogue unites us to Himself and daily feeds us; He also unites us to each other. Either analogy proves the substance of bread to be the analogical term in the elements.

The analogy of the mystical body has a further reference. If the "Body of Christ" involves the doctrine of the Church, does not transubstantiation involve a substantial presence of this Body too? The syllogism is plain:

The Eucharist is the sacrament not only of the body of Christ, but also of the mystical body. Whence Paul says, We being many are one bread, one body. But bread is not transubstantiated into the mystical body of Christ. Therefore neither into the true body of Christ. For of both bodies equally is it declared the sacrament. (Def. 407)

Along with this argument ⁽³⁾ Martyr includes another implication of the Church as the Body of Christ. Are not members scattered throughout Britain, Spain and so on, yet truly united in one Body? ⁽⁴⁾

A further analogical argument, and a decisive one, is the fact that the

1. Tract. 56.

2. in I Cor. 11.24; cf. Disp. II, opening speech: "a convenient substance should be kept in sacraments. And regarding the Eucharist it is what nourishes us, which is done by the substance of bread, not by accidents".

3. cf. also Tract. 22, in I Cor. 12.12, and Epit., Sent. 14.15. In the last, Martyr adds a further implication: "The poor and those oppressed for the name of Christ are His body".

4. in I Cor. 12.12, Tract., Praef. etc. A similar analogy is that of husband and wife still "bone of bone" although separated in place.

water of Baptism is never thought of as transubstantiated into the Holy Spirit!

In Baptism water is said to be the fountain of regeneration, and this agrees well since its substance is retained, for the accidents of water would not be analogous ... just as the conjunction of Baptism with the grace of the Holy Spirit does not repel or extinguish the nature of water, even so the matter of this sacrament does not destroy and cast away the being of the signs. (Tract. 11.56)

We see moreover in the Sacrament of Baptism, that the Holy Spirit and the remission of sins are given: yet we do not say that these lie hidden in the waters - nay rather we put on Christ, yet no one says that the water is transubstantiated. (Tract. 10)

(Euthymius) compares the water of Baptism with regeneration, and makes a like analogy (simile $\lambda\upsilon\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$) ... The body and blood of Christ are so contained in the bread and wine as our regeneration is contained in the waters. (Def. 243f)

Perhaps the most fruitful thing about this analogy is its implication for our union with Christ.

Again ... we reason from the men themselves who are baptized, of whom Scripture plainly says that they put aside the old man and are born again - and yet is no transubstantiation imagined in them, although that generation is described as a motion by which a new substance is acquired ... if we interpret that generation to be new, and the nativity to be spiritual, do we not allow the same to the Eucharist? (Tract. 15)

Martyr often brings the argument that the words of Consecration apply to us more than to bread, and that they are applied to bread only in relation to our mutation.

Yea, we ourselves are more joined to Christ than is bread. For Christ is joined in the way He is to bread to this end, that we should truly be united to Him. And the words by which bread is called the body of Christ belong more unto us than unto that, which by nature understands and believes nothing. (Disp. III, vs. Tresh.)

The Fathers were fond of stressing our change into Christ - Cyril even says corporaliter. And Martyr is willing to agree with this language since Christ is in us "truly, wholly, solidly". (1)

1. vere, integre et solide - Def. 752f. Martyr says that divinity is in Christ and in us per essentiam et per gratiam, the difference being that in Christ one hypostasis is formed. cf. Part IV of the Def., Sententiae ac dicta Sanctorum Patrum.

We ourselves by a faithful participation in the Lord's Supper are fed, and in a manner transelemented by a certain kind of spiritual change, into the body of Christ. (Epit., Sent. 11)

We are transelemented into Christ. (Def. 104)

In this context of analogy of substance, we should note that Gardiner makes a feeble attempt to satisfy the sacramental ratio by claiming that for accidents, "the power of signification by reason of analogy, and the virtue of nourishing are retained per miraculum". (1) On this Martyr comments:

Therefore will there be a miracle to banish the nature of bread and wine, and again another, no less a miracle, to restore it? O incredible fertility - of miracles or of lies, shall I say?
(Def. 252)

The Words of Consecration and their Effect.

Peter Martyr does not spend much time over the fine points of Romanist dogma, except to remark upon such folly as this:

The Papists do not know to which words the Consecration owes itself. For Scotus and Innocent III say the Consecration is in the word Benedixit; others, Iube haec preferri, others, Hoc est corpus meum.
(Def., Obj. 84)

Such cavilling characterizes the whole doctrine of transubstantiation. All that is necessary, claims Martyr, is the acknowledgment of a proper "mutation of the symbols", a "sacramental mutation". (2) He is quite willing to admit a definite change in the Sacrament, in fact two changes. The first and chief is our change into Christ. But there is a corresponding change in the elements themselves. They become sacraments, "which they certainly were not before". (3) Now in examining this difficult concept, we must keep before us Martyr's normative doctrine of the effectuality of the Word:

-
1. quoted by Martyr, Def. 251. Chedsey had used the same argument. (Disp. II)
 2. Def. 273.
 3. Def. 70.

Those symbols which are meanwhile added to the Word of God, while the mysteries are celebrated, without doubt make for the greatest certitude: for they are seals of the promises. Yet I altogether deny that they establish Christ more present to us than do the words or the promises. (Def. 446)

The change in the eucharistic elements is analogous to two things: first, the change in human words by which the power of the Holy Spirit makes the Gospel a saving power; second, the change in ourselves. This second is the decisive analogy: when the Fathers say that the elements are transformed, converted and transelemented (transformari, converti et transelementari), this we take to mean sacramentally. ⁽¹⁾ For we too may be rightly said to be "transmuted or transelemented" into Christ. And this is the decisive principle operative here: in each case, what Martyr means is a spiritual change (spiritualis mutatio). ⁽²⁾

Who doubt this, that the communication of faithful men is much more a commerce with the flesh and blood of Christ than with bread and wine? But if so, no one will pretend it to be a firm argument by denying from the major to the minor. Thus it may rightly be concluded: Men are not, by the power of the Sacrament, transubstantiated into the body of Christ; therefore by much less are bread and wine by the power of Consecration transubstantiated into the body of Christ. For it is not consistent with the words of Consecration to be more able in bread and wine, than the Sacrament of Baptism is in those who are dipped. (Def. 409)

And this may be taken as his analogical principle in brief:

As we are changed into Christ, so is bread changed into the body of Christ (ut nos mutamur in Christum, ita panis mutatur in corpus Christi). (Def., Obj. 139)

The mutation in the elements, then, is not only in order to our mutation, but analogical to that. As that is spiritual, so is this. Indeed, the reality of our mutation is eschatological: we are made capable of resurrection, we are joined

-
1. Def. 805ff; cf. 410: Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Theodoret, Damascenus and Theophylact all speak of our change into Christ in such terms.
 2. Def. 43; cf. Obj. 152, where he quotes Irenaeus (adv. Valent. 4.4): Panis, terrenus accepta vocatione ab Verbo dei, non amplius est communis panis: sed efficitur Euchaistia, quae constat ex duabus rebus, terrena, et coelesti ... Ita corpora nostra illam sumentia non sunt amplius corruptibilia.

by invisible bonds. So the elements of the sacraments derive their power and efficacy from the fact that the Holy Spirit as the reality of the Christian life condescends to use them as the signs of the eschatological content of that life - the nourishment of Christ's Person, real yet hidden until the final revelation and consummation of our union with Him.

In the Oxford Disputation Peter Martyr was called to answer Chedsey's argument from the Father's language about the change effected by Consecration. In a long speech he describes the sacramental change in detail. ⁽¹⁾

I answer that (Ambrose) meant to prove nothing else than the change of bread which we call a sacramental change, and meant not that the nature of bread should be taken away ... I grant such a change to be of the natures, as they receive other conditions, and ascend to a new degree: for they become sacraments, and they were not so before.

The power of God effects to add "a sacramental power" to the bread, its substance not being changed.

He is able to make common bread and wine a most effectual sacrament ... such a change is it, in which bread and wine are translated from the natural order and profane degree in which they were, to a sacramental state and order, both by the work of the Holy Spirit and by the institution of the Lord.

The matter of the sacrament, which is "most specially sought by the faithful", is not fastened to the elements, but "by blessing is joined to them": they receive a new "quality and condition", namely the power of signifying the body and blood of Christ. ⁽²⁾ This is the spiritual and heavenly change.

1. Disp. IV, Q. 2.

2. cf. Def. 474: "the body of Christ seems to be added as a quality". In Def. 581 Martyr draws two analogies between the Eucharist and Christ. Christ's substance remained the same after His Ascension, as does that of bread after consecration. But also, "as bread is changed, since it is raised to a higher level and made a Sacrament, so also is the body of Christ changed, since it is endowed with glory and incorruptibility and power". cf. in I Cor. 15.38, concerning the nature of the resurrection body: "The mutation will not be of the body as to substance, but as to accidents". "Ornaments" and "conditions" of a new order are given, for "Unless the same body is raised up, death is not conquered"; and Catech. 24.

For while this holy rite is being performed, there is brought to the signs, through the institution and words of the Lord a sacramental reference. And that respect of signifying both the mystical body and the body of Christ Himself is grounded not in the accidents of bread and wine, but even in their natures, through the coming of the Holy Spirit Who uses them as instruments.

Rather than meaning a physical-material change in the substance, the sacramental mutation depends entirely upon the substance remaining whole and true - because this sacramental change is nothing else than the analogical reference now made open to the faithful:

those things (which) now sustain another quality, and have obtained a greater dignity, namely a sacramental state ... But who doubts that consecration is a sacramental affair? In this it appears that the sign, regarding its nature, remains bread, and yet by consecration it is sacramentally the body of Christ.

Concluding this argument on Ambrose, Martyr points to his use of the analogy of our rebirth, "from the change made in us, when we are regenerated". But he is told to re-read Ambrose at home by himself, and he will see that transubstantiation is meant!

Instruments of Nourishment.

If the body of Christ is really in the Eucharist, it must be grasped by us either by the soul or by the body. It is not grasped by the soul, for nothing corporeal enters it. If they say by the body, we ask, to what end? If they say, that man may be sanctified, that will be to act preposterously. For sanctification begins from the soul, not the body. And the Eucharist is a spiritual food, instituted to feed the mind, not the belly. (Def., Obj. 43)

Sanctification begins in the mind, when we learn that Christ was given for us on the Cross.

We are said to be sanctified by His flesh since we place all our trust in His death and blood. (Def. 722)

Although it may redound even to the body, this is always indirect, through the soul as the channel of blessing. Transubstantiation, however, means that in the

Eucharist the body rather than the soul is sanctified! For what is the instrument of the Holy Spirit here?

We know indeed the instruments which God uses - such are words and sacraments, to reach the soul through the body. (Def. 192)

That is, the place of the body as instrumentally valid in man's redemption must not be misconstrued as the place where redemption actually takes place. That would be to anticipate the Second Advent in a carnal manner, and that is precisely what the doctrine of transubstantiation implies: it takes the place of the Second Advent, and so throws the Coming in Judgment into a remote and theologically irrelevant future.

For you in your falsity gather three advents to be set forth: the first of the incarnation, another of transubstantiation, the third of the last judgment. (Def. 31)

Gardiner locates the mystery in the bread, a mystery of a special kind of visitation, of a "real presence" of the flesh of Christ. But we must lift up our souls unto Heaven, there to feed upon Him Who is our Bread. The nutrition is His work, and cannot be shared by bread, which is ⁱⁿcapable of such spiritual power of sanctification.

The bread is said to be consecrated, which is separated from profane use to figure and represent the body of Christ, and the spiritual nutrition through Christ. Not that bread can be the body of Christ, for of such sanctity it is incapable. (eius enim sanctitatis non est capax). (Def. 270)

The principle to be followed here is, "Nourishment is no better than that which is eaten".⁽¹⁾ Only Christ as spiritual food (spiritualis nutrimentum) has use and value for our sanctification.

That real presence of the body of Christ offers no utility which we cannot have from a spiritual presence. For Christ in John 6 promised eternal life to those who eat His flesh, that He would abide in them and they in Him. But nothing more can be expected from a real presence. Therefore it is useless and superfluous, and by it nothing is gained. (Def., Obj. 52)

1. Alimentum non est melius re quae alitur - Def., Obj. 88.

The key here is the "vivifying flesh of Christ" (vivificam esse carnem Christi), and this kind of eating, this manner of nourishment, dictates the nature of the Eucharist.

The Lord's Supper has only added symbols to that manducation which is described in John: so that by those symbols we might be vehemently and effectively incited to exercise the inward manducation ... By the outward sign the mind is excited to comprehend more closely the flesh of Christ through faith. That apprehension sanctifies us, and gives eternal life. (Def. 212)

This teaching about the nutritional quality of the New Manhood of Christ may be linked with Peter Martyr's use of the Pauline distinction between the inner and outer man. (1) This inner man signifies "not simply the soul but the soul already regenerated". It is only by the homo interior, therefore, that sanctification is received - spiritual things require a spiritual instrument.

For since those things are spiritual, nor can be taken without the spiritual instrument of faith, therefore we conclude that those who are void of faith can neither eat the flesh of the Lord, nor receive the benefits of the Holy Spirit. (Def. 315)

Here again the Holy Spirit is decisive. His urging and inspiration (instinctus et afflatus) is in nature prior to faith, in time simultaneous (natura prior fide, tempore vero simul). The nourishment of the Body of Christ means the presence of His Spirit, therefore the eating is spiritual. (2) This is why John 6 "greatly refutes transubstantiation" -

that word bread in John is to be referred not to the symbols, but to the spiritual food, about which doubtless Christ was then beginning to teach. (Def. 308)

For to eat and drink the Person of Christ is nothing else than to abide in Him,

-
1. homo interior et exterior - Def., Obj. 94.
 2. "About Baptism there is no ambiguity. In the Eucharist also, it is the Spirit by Whom we are quickened" - in I Cor. 12.12; cf. Tract. 1-17: the Holy Spirit is the Vicar of Christ.

and He in us - which is without controversy a spiritual matter. The true role of the sacraments, therefore, will be as follows:

We, after upholding Grace, do not exclude the use of the mysteries: indeed for the fostering and increasing (fovere et augere) of faith and Grace, we seal the promises of God by them. (Def. 312)

The "proper effect" of receiving the body of Christ is, union with Him. This is the positive principle by which Peter Martyr refutes the Romanists. (1)

From that opinion of the adversaries it follows that the wicked eat the body of Christ just as do the saints. But that is false: for the body of Christ cannot be separated (divelli) from His Spirit. Wherefore since the unfaithful have not the Spirit of Christ, they cannot eat His body. They have not the Spirit of Christ, because they lack faith: by which instrument all spiritual things are received. (quo instrumento omnia spiritualia recipiuntur). (Def. Obj. 94)

The Eucharist is an instrument of nourishment, but the quality of nourishment belongs wholly unto Christ as the living Lord and Saviour.

But we say, not only the blood of Christ which was shed for us, but the whole Christ (totus Christus) who truly is holy, when apprehended by faith, is the proper cause of our sanctification. Assuredly the Eucharist may be called an instrument of sanctification. For through it the Holy Spirit excites faith in us, through which very cause of sanctification we clearly apprehend Christ and His blood shed for us. (Def. 458)

The Wicked and the Body of Christ.

The thing itself of the sacrament is received by no one to his destruction. (Res ipsa sacramenti ab nemine recipitur ad exitium) (Def. 331)

Qned. Shall they not receive the body of Christ, then, who are without faith?

Mart. They shall not receive it, for they lack the instrument by which the body of Christ is received, as I have showed before.

Qned. And is it there, although it is not received by them?

Mart. Yes, by a sacramental signification it is in the elements, since they signify, represent and give to us the body and blood of Christ. (Disp. IV)

-
1. in Def. 160 Martyr calls Christ Host (hospes) as well as food in the Supper.

On account of the sacramental mutation which Peter Martyr stresses he allows that the carnal eating of the elements is an eating of the sacrament - he can even, because of the communication of the properties noted above, allow this to be called an eating of the "body of Christ" in the sense that this is what the element may be sacramentally called. But here the vital distinction is involved:

the thing itself of which (this) is a sacrament, was to all men for life, to none for ruin, whoever was its partaker ... the thing of the sacrament, that is the body and blood of Christ, can be eaten by no one unto ruin. Wherefore who appropriates to himself death out of it, receives only the sacrament, but not the matter of the sacrament.
(Def. 331)

Here we return to the principle, per se and per accidens. Inasmuch as Christ Himself was manifested for one purpose only, namely, the giving of life, although by their own sinful rejection of Him men took judgment and death unto themselves, to which He is related per accidens, even so do the sacraments (like the word) operate. (1)

the wicked eat the elements of the Eucharist to their judgment, just as the false and profane through Baptism attain to nothing save the outward washing. (Def. 328)

the true cause of either our salvation or our rejection to satan is not to be attributed to the Sacraments or to the outward Word, except insofar as these are instruments by which faith is excited in us through the Holy Spirit, by which we can apprehend Christ Himself, and all His gifts and promises. (Def. 723)

In the important section in the commentary on the critical text, I Corinthians 11.27, Peter Martyr distinguishes three kinds of unworthy eaters. The first two, those who are altogether atheist, or possess only an "historical faith" (fides historica) draw damnation and death to themselves when they communicate. A third type, possessing true faith yet neglecting life and manners, receive a

1. cf. Chap. 1; Def. 722: transub. is not necessary to the "unworthy eating" since there was such in the O.T. too (I Cor. 10); 820: all things were to the ancients in figura - and some took judgment to themselves in a figure.

"communion of health" since Christ remains in them, yet often are chastened and recalled to penitence.

And in short, we cannot state anything else of all those kinds, except that, whatever a person has of sincere faith, so much will he receive from the Sacrament of the thing signified, and to his enjoyment.

To say that the wicked eat the body of Christ injures the symbols, destroying the analogy, and "pulls down the matter of the sacrament". But in one sense the wicked are "guilty of the matter" (res), since they condemn and deride the signification, even though they grasp only the symbols. But those who are not joined to Christ cannot eat His body. The argument is "partly from the nature of the thing received" - since the body of Christ cannot be divorced from His Spirit so that to eat His body means to have His Spirit; and "partly from the condition of the receivers" - since the wicked one as regards the life of the spirit, is dead (quoad animi vitam, mortuus est): "he lacks a soul by whose faculties these things can be received".

Without doubt they have only the signs to be received, and that to their own condemnation; for Christ is not in them, nor do they abide in Christ.
(Epit. 2.7)

Moreover, the relation between Word and sacrament has obvious relevance here:

Since the Word by itself cannot stir up its hearers, when they are destitute of faith and spirit, that they grasp the thing signified, by how much less do these symbols, which if they be compared with the Word, are by no means more firm? (in I Cor. 11.27)

That which is determinative in the sacrament is not the consecration as resulting in a certain entity, but, Martyr continues:

To the worthy or the unworthy eating these have regard: faith towards the promises, a just and right estimation of this Sacrament, a rite lawfully observed, and a holy conversation.

Now this is not to be understood as accenting the subjective element in the partaking to a false degree - it does not, for example, mean a demand for such worthiness as to deter any of the faithful from the sacrament; nor does it mean a temporary humility in outward things - so that the minister puts aside ornaments or rich vestments ... and dons them again afterwards. (1) No, "this dignity ought to be perpetual". We are therefore to examine (probare) ourselves, as regards "conscience and the inner soul". (2) For the abuse of the Lord's Supper carries with it, accidentally but inevitably, a judgment. Peter Martyr indicates that just as there is a public as well as a private abuse (the Mass as a whole is the public abuse) so there is a public as well as a private punishment.

So it happens today. The Lord's Supper in almost the whole western Church, is corrupt. But who sees not, in how much evil and calamity the Christian world is enveloped? (in I Cor. 11.30)

Not only wars, plagues and s^dcn, but even "the high price of corn" (caritas annonae) is a symptom of the judgment!

1. in I Cor. 11.27.

2. Ibid., 11.28 - this does not mean the Papist auricular confession, since Tota in fide et poenitentia consistit. Fides dogmata respicit, et poenitentia conversationem.

CHAPTER VIII : THE EUCHARIST AND UBIQUITY.

The problems of Lutheran doctrine did not weigh heavily upon Peter Martyr in the earlier period of his eucharistic teaching - the Oxford Treatise, for example, approaches the problem with an easy hand and in few words as compared with its discussion of transubstantiation. It was the subsequent trials which he underwent at the hands of the Lutheran pastors at Strassburg, in his second period of teaching there, and in particular the violent attack of Johannus Brentius after Martyr had removed to Zürich, which called forth his detailed refutation of the doctrine of ubiquity, by which consubstantiation was upheld. We shall examine first this earlier teaching of the Treatise, and then the more important work, the Dialogue.

A. THE TEACHING OF THE 'TREATISE'.

In this work Peter Martyr is chiefly concerned to refute the heretical doctrine of transubstantiation. But after having so done, he turns to two other opinions, commonly associated with the names of Luther and Zwingli - although it would seem that Luther spoke "not so grossly", and Zwingli "not so slenderly". Because of the common misunderstanding between the two men,

there was stirred up a contention more than was meet, and was a cause of great mischief. Whereas indeed the contention was rather about words than about the matter. (1)

Indeed, Martyr is willing to declare about these two doctrines:

which of the two is appointed we do not greatly care, if it be understood soundly. Now we shall but speak of them, in order to see what we shall judge in both to be avoided, and what to be received.

1. Quotations in this section, unless otherwise shown, are from the second part of the Treatise, in the L.C., Tract. 65 - 75.

Removing the doctrines from the personalities, therefore, he proceeds to consider each in turn.

Although the Lutheran opinion begins by admitting both natures wholly present in the sacrament, and by admitting the figure synecdoche (the part standing for the whole), yet it is not consistent, and ends by allowing a presence of Christ "really, as they say, corporeally and naturally", and a presence not local but "definitively". And so:

a true and real conjunction of the sacrament with the matter may be shown, which being granted, means that the wicked as well as the pious receive the body of Christ.

Martyr argues that the use of figures in Scripture is abundantly evident, and "in teaching of doctrine there is no doubt but that figures and tropes are used". The Lutherans, however, contend that such matters must be taken simpliciter, and therefore join the two natures together in the sacrament, the humanity of Christ equally and in the same way with his divinity. Martyr denies this conclusion - he does not divide the two natures,

yet it follows not therefore that what pertains to the one should be given to the other ... Indeed we grant that the divinity of Christ is everywhere, but we shall not attribute the same thing to his body and humanity.

The risen humanity of Christ means that "the nature of man's body is preserved". Thus their favourite text, Ephesians 5.22, 'Christ fills all things', since the verb is middle voice, can mean either that Christ perfects the gifts of His members, or that His mystical body is filled by Church members - but not that the humanity of Christ is equally extensive with his divinity.

This is the heart of Peter Martyr's opposition to the doctrine of ubiquity, that by the Resurrection and Ascension faith locates the Risen Man above the earthly elements.

But if any man, while the sacramental rite is exercised, well instructed in the mystery, shall turn his mind to worship Christ reigning in heaven, he acts rightly and dutifully ...

For the life of faith means communion with the Risen Lord, a spiritual presence which is expressly set forth in John 6: "over and beside this what is required?" This kind of eating of Christ is not complemented by another kind of eating, for "the two are all one", the sacramental eating means a confirming by signs of the spiritual.

The words of scripture drive us not to so gross and corporeal a presence; and faith is of the word of God, wherefore faith must not embrace it.

The Fathers, moreover, expressly teach the necessity of the sursum corda in contacting the glorified Christ. Peter Martyr, here and in the Defensio, quotes especially the words of Chrysostom: (1)

we must ascend into heaven when we communicate, if we would enjoy the body of Christ ... being made eagles in this life, we should fly to heaven itself, or rather above heaven. For where the body is, there too are the eagles. (Ubi enim est cadaver, illic et aquilae) The corpse is the body of Christ on account of death. For if he had not fallen, we had not risen. But he calls us eagles to show that he who comes to this body must strive after Him on high, (ad alta eum oportere contendere), and have nothing common with earth, nor traffic or crawl with inferior things, but ever fly to things above (sed ad superiora semper volare), and behold the sun of righteousness, and have most sharp eyes of the mind - for this is the table of eagles, not of crows. (aquilarum enim, non graculorum haec mensa est)

Further Patristic sources are Augustine, "We are with Him in heaven by hope, He is with us on earth by love" for example; Cyril, Vigilius and Fulgentius concerning the distinction between the natures as to place; and Bernard.

Finally, Martyr warns that the likeness to the union of the two natures in Christ is a likeness and not an identity of proportion - the doctrine of

1. Def. 9-10, Tract. 72. The quotation is from Chrysostom's Homily 24 on I Cor.

consubstantiation is ultimately the same thing as transubstantiation, since it destroys the analogy and makes another hypostatic union, a false presence of Christ in this age and earth.

But if afterward you would appoint as great a union between bread and the body of Christ as there is between the divine nature and the human in Christ, that would by no means be conceded: because there would be made of bread and the body of Christ one hypostasis, that is, one subject (suppositus), so that they could never be severed from each other, which is most absurd.

Thus far the Treatise. But in 1555 Martyr wrote to Calvin: ⁽¹⁾

The Saxons do not rest. They have issued a most vain Farrago (for so they call it). They gather certain sentences out of the Fathers, and also out of Luther, Philip, Brentius, Pomeranus and such like. They add to this Bucer, Illyricus and Joachim Westphal, that they may be shown to agree among themselves. Also they have inserted certain Epistles written sometime against us. But they touch neither you nor me by name. They shamefully rebuke John a Lasco, not indeed that he maintains a private opinion, but simply under the name of a Sacramentarian. And, please God!, they have in this Fragment a special title, That the body of Christ is everywhere (Quod Christi corpus sit ubique). This they now openly defend, and this article they treat in three or four folios, and use no other reason than that the Son of God took the nature of man into one hypostasis.

This was the beginning of a new phase of the debate. The doctrine of the ubiquity of the body of Christ now became the central point. The following year brought good hope of Martyr's removal to Zürich, for the situation at Strassburg was becoming intolerable. But it was not until 1561 that Martyr drew up the full-scale rebuttal against Brentius, the Dialogue in which "Pantachus ... sustains the

-
1. Sept. 23, 1555, L.C. 1097. The debate had great interest for the English Reformers, as their correspondence shows (Zur. Lett. 1558-1579). e.g. Parkhurst to Bullinger, Sept. 1, 1561 (p 98): "I wish the Ubiquitarians a better mind, if indeed they have a mind at all ... persons over whom you and Martyr will gain an easy conquest". cf. our 'Portrait', final section.

person of Brentius, and Orothetes, myself"(1)

B. THE TEACHING OF THE 'DIALOGUE'.

The general argument of the Dialogus De Utraque In Christo Natura is set forth as follows:

Dialogue concerning the two natures in Christ: how they go together inseparably in one person of Christ, meanwhile not giving up their properties, so that the Humanity of Christ cannot be everywhere without the body; and contrary arguments clearly and kindly replied to, and the matter of the Lord's Supper illustrated from scripture and the testimonies of the Fathers.

The Dialogue is divided into six sections: On the Humanity of Christ, being God; On the Properties of the Natures in Christ; On Ubiquity; On the Ascension of Christ into Heaven; On the Place in Heaven of the Body of Christ; and, On the Presence of the Body of Christ. Much of the teaching echoes what we have set forth from his other works, especially the Defensio, and the many Patristic quotations are repeated there. But the main theme is simply, whether the body of Christ everywhere, as Pantachus holds (corpus Christi esse ubique).

Ubiquity as the Eutychian Heresy Revived.

The Lutheran object is to prove a presence of Christ in the Supper which is "real, substantial, corporeal". To accomplish this, they accuse the Reformed theologians (whom they call "Sacramentarians") of following the Nestorian heresy, that is, of dividing the two natures in Christ to such an extent as to deny the truth of the union in one hypostasis. Let us paraphrase a most revealing section of the dialogue in this connection.

1. Letter to Parkhurst, Aug. 23, 1561, L.C. 113. cf. Jewel to Martyr acknowledging the work, Feb. 7, 1562 (Zur. Lett. p 100). Martyr represented Jewel (Palaemon) as the moderator in the dispute. The names of the disputants are most fitting: the one represents $\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\chi\omicron\upsilon$, 'everywhere', and the other, $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$, 'a fixer of boundaries'.

Pantachus. Though you support your opinion a thousand times, I stick to the hypostatic union: the two natures in Christ are not two, but constitute one person.

Orothetes. We receive that union, as do the faithful and orthodox: we do not divide the two natures, like Nestorius, nor yet confuse them, like Eutyches. Christ is one person, having two natures conjoined within himself, yet both complete and without violation in the properties.

Pan. Because of the conjunction, wherever the deity is, there also will the humanity be, since Christ cannot remain a person, unless the two thus united in him by birth are maintained, so that the one is never present without the other.

Oro. That does not follow - you are guilty of false reasoning, because you admit an equivocation (*ἑνωμένης*, quem nostri vocant aequivocationis), taking the union thus made of the two natures in Christ as if the whole divine nature were included in the human, and the human were extended and expanded (vel humana ampliata et dilatata) so that each nature is stretched out coextensively ... in this you follow Eutyches, who confused and mingled the two natures ... You think the persons are sundered if He is constituted divine, when the humanity is not present. Not at all. It suffices the Deity, as immense and infinite, to support and substantiate (fulcire et sustentare) the humanity in his person (hypostasis), wherever it may be. Although the body of Christ is in heaven, when the Son of God is present in the Church, or elsewhere, He is never without His human nature, having this joined unto himself in one person.

(pp 9F - 11A) (1)

Now it is obvious that much of this controversy has more to do with words than facts. We must remember, however, that the beginning of the debate lay in the serious question as to the manner of presence of the body of Christ in the Supper, whether the wicked also partook of Him. It was by forcing back the problem to its actual basis in Christology that the disputants tried to solve it. Peter Martyr felt that the doctrine of ubiquity meant the denial of the humanity of Christ, a divinising of it after the manner of the Eutychian heresy. The critical point therefore becomes the function of the properties of each nature of the glorified Christ Jesus.

The Properties of the New Humanity.

Una persona Deus et homo est, et utrumque est unus Christus Iesus,
ubique per id quod Deus est, in coelo autem per id quod homo.
(Augustine)

This quotation from Augustine sums up Peter Martyr's doctrine of the two natures in Christ. Christ is apprehended only and always as the divine-human Person; yet His divine ubiquity must not be transferred to his humanity. The reason for this is, quite simply, that then He becomes something other than a man (quidvis aliud quam homo).⁽¹⁾ Unless the truth of His humanity persists even in glorification, the reality of the Incarnation is denied. Peter Martyr appears to begin from this principle, and accommodates his eucharistic teaching to it; Brentius begins from the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation in the Supper, and accommodates his Christology to that.

What is the nature of the resurrection body? Peter Martyr asks. Pantachus answers, since you accept the Athanasian symbol, that there is one Christ -

just so there will be one infinite, one immense Being.

Oro. You have the matter well. One, infinite and immense, do we admit. Yet the dispute by no means rests, whether this property of immensity is communicated to the human nature of Christ ...

Pan. But in that are we equal enough, since if we speak not of the unity of the persons, but of the diversity of substances, we say that nothing prevents this agreeing with one nature per se, but the other per accidens, as is given in the schools of dialectics. For it is the common sentence spoken of Christ, 'Whatever is given

-
1. p 23G. Martyr's Christology involves his doctrine of analogy, as an excellent passage, in I Reg. fol. 16A, An Dei Mand., indicates: Christ is able to be "a familiar example" for our imitation (as Matt. 5.48 implies) because His humanity was not Docetic but real. The significance of this true humanity, however, is this: "the ratio between Him and the heavenly Father is not to be understood simpliciter, since the soul of Christ, which was part of His humanity, was not immense, being a creature". Thus the Sicut of Christ's injunction does not express equality, but similitude. Christ is truly human as limited, and therefore a valid example for us.

to the Son of God by nature, comes to the Son of man through grace'.
(ppl9F - 20A)

The communicatio idiomatum is for the Lutheran an ontologically real communication - Pantachus "wants to transfuse the divine properties to the humanity of Christ". Now although God is simplex, and therefore without accidents, yet He has attributes, such as immensity or ubiquity. But to apply this to humanity is to destroy the human property of circumscription, to be in a place. (1) You cannot remove these properties from humanity and leave it unharmed (incolumus). Therefore the resurrected or glorified human body will be endowed with properties only according to its capacity.

Paul meant not that the body should be transformed into a spirit, but taught that the human body should be drawn unto the property of a spirit in regard to knowledge and feeling (quoad notitiam et affectum), as much as could be done without violation to its nature (salva eius natura) ... through this diversity of qualities and conditions, the subject, that is the substance of our bodies is not to be altered; for exactly (prorsus) the same body and the same flesh will be raised up. (De Resurr. 59-60)

Pantachus explicitly denies that this communication of the properties should refer only to the verbal-nominal communion which Orothetes holds. Orothetes teaches that such properties as "immortality, light, glory and the rest of which human nature is capable" are gifted to the glorified body, whereas others such as "eternity, immensity and ubiquity" cannot be communicated. (2)

What of the power of God? Pantachus asks - does not the divine power and

-
1. esse in loco, et quidem localiter - p 23F. cf. 3B: "Four gifts are assigned to the body of Christ and indeed of the blessed, by the Scholastics, Impassibilitas, Claritas, Agilitas et Subtilitas." But since Pantachus has added a new gift, a new name is required, which Pantachus calls "the monstrous name of Ubiquity". In this same passage Orothetes also mentions the historically interesting name associated with Luther's sarcasm, Suermoros.
 2. quorum natura humana est capax - p 30B

industry make possible - nay, even easy! - the ubiquity of the body of Christ?

Nevertheless from the bare omnipotence of God we conclude the body of Christ to be everywhere, and in many places. We have divine writings as witnesses of this, and among them the most important is the word of the Supper: the Lord indeed said, 'This is my body'. (5B)

Apart from the petitio principii, the argument is plainly, as Orothetes charges, an appeal to the divine omnipotence as a last resort. But it is no let to the power of God if there are certain things, by nature contrary, which He "cannot" unite:

And some things I affirm to be, which are not at all through His defect or fault able to become, unimpaired and whole notwithstanding the divine power. For what things are facts cannot by any power be undone.

Martyr's principle is, the power of God is not compromised when we say that it does not extend to what would imply contradiction,⁽¹⁾ as he had taught in the Defensio:

And we know, two contradictory things cannot be true at once: such as, that there should be a human body, and not be a human body, at the same time. (Def. 517)

Duo contradictoria non posse simul esse vera - therefore the analogical nature of the hypostatic union must be preserved. For such a relationship is guaranteed by the Scriptural doctrine:

these kinds of illusions oppose the Ascension of the Lord, and the true human nature. To this Scripture testifies that Christ is contained in the heavens, so far as pertains to the body. (Def. 517)

In Objection 143 of the Defensio, Martyr uses the doctrine of ubiquity, as representing what the transubstantiator also must say, to show that Consecration cannot be thought of as introducing the body of Christ into the Sacrament, since

1. Ego vero e contra tibi affirmo, nulla vi, fieri posse ut res creata sit ubique (7B); cf. 5D, quoting Augustine (De Civ. Dei 5.10): Ista propterea fieri non possunt, quia seipsa destruunt, et (ut loquar in scholis) contradictionem implicant.

it must have been there already. Then he reminds Gardiner that this argument is not his own, since with all the Fathers, he affirms that

wherever the body of Christ is, there is his divinity also: but not the opposite: wherever is the divinity, there also is the body. For the human nature was so assumed by the Word, that that lost nothing of its infinity and immense latitude.

God cannot effect contradiction; therefore each nature remains whole; therefore the humanity of the Risen Lord retains the bodily property of circumscription, so that the divine property of ubiquity must not be attributed to it, except according to the nominal communication which the Fathers allow. Thus speaking of the agilitas of the resurrected body, Peter Martyr writes:

And in this consists the fact that the soul shall perfectly govern the body, so that the weight and burden of the flesh shall be no hindrance to it. This property indeed belongs to local motion (ad localem motum). Wherefore it is a wonder that the Ubiquitists admit this quality to be in the bodies of the blessed, as they write in their books, and yet affirm that heaven is everywhere, so that they will not attribute definite places unto Christ's body and to ours, when we shall be blessed, as though local motion can be allowed apart from a place. (De Resurr. 58)

This concern for the continuing humanity of the glorified Jesus Christ leads inevitably to a concern for the locus of His Body. We have somewhat anticipated this concern in the teaching that the Sacrament is a "heavenly affair", requiring a "lifting up of hearts" to its proper reception. Now we must examine in detail this conception.

The Heavenly Places - and Beyond.

I marvel greatly that in beginning, you cannot shake off thoughts of the dimensions of Geometry, when there is dispute about the body of Christ - Pantachus.

Orothetes is charged with cleaving to a maxim of Aristotle's - which he willingly embraces - that 'the whole body is in a place' (ὅλον σῶμα ἐν τότῳ); but he relies even more on Augustine's sentence, 'Remove spaces of places from

bodies, and they are nowhere: and because they are nowhere, neither do they exist'.⁽¹⁾ It is this concern for spaces of places which Pantachus describes as mere geometrical juggling.

Pan. But the same applies to what you teach of the body of Christ, that it is extended and diffused geometrically in every place, like a patch (tanquam alutem).

Oro. Not like a patch, nor any other kind of covering ... the human body is constant, it cannot fill a place which it will not reach. Moreover, how that can happen otherwise than by extension of its magnitude, is an invention of yours alone in our time, although the Papists give occasion to you, either by explaining or by defending their transubstantiation: but you surpass them by a great length. (Dial. 3D)

Pantachus accused Orothetes of hiding the body of Christ "in a dark corner of heaven". But although Orothetes insists on the ascribing of a definite locus to the body of Christ, he qualifies this spatial-geometrical language in a most significant and decisive manner.

But we do not assert a body as being outside heaven, nowhere in a general way: since beyond the firmament which they make the eighth circle, is a region most blessed, where is the body of Christ: and the saints not only hold places, seats and mansions, but after the resurrection dwell there. But yet if we indeed comprehend that region called heaven, it may happen that the body is not at all discovered. (4C)

I affirm the body of Christ to be in some certain place of an outward heaven (aliquo certo loco externi coeli), but in a most extended and enlarged way, so that He is free to stand, sit, walk or roam about. But if you define such a place with reference to the daily revolution of the earth, then your absurdity needs no answer. (75D)

Peter Martyr is quite willing to admit that such spatial categories are not to be understood in terms of geometric and astronomic science. There is need to remind ourselves of the impropriety of our theological language once again.⁽²⁾

1. ad Dard.: Nam spacia locorum tolle corporibus, nusquam erunt: et quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt. (Dial. 4B, 24B, etc.)
2. cf. Def. 4: "What (Paul) says of the death and resurrection of Christ is most clear; but what 'to sit at the right hand of God' signifies is not altogether so plain. It is a metaphorical kind of speech, taken from kings and princes, who place on their right hand those whom they hold in great honour and esteem.. yet we must not think that the body of Christ is poured abroad so far as His divinity and the right hand of the Father ... Nor can we understand anything else by 'the right hand of the Lord' than the force and power of the Spirit."

But what is the doctrinal truth he is seeking to teach and safeguard? In a most helpful letter he states: (1)

But I say that the human nature of Christ was always comprehended within some certain place ... If he shall be in heaven as to his human nature, until the latter day as the Apostle says, why seek we his flesh and blood upon the earth? ... I believe that the human nature of Christ abides in the heavens separated from the lower world, even unto the end of the world, and that the same shall come again from thence to judge the world, as the Apostles were warned by the Angels and as we confess in the Article of faith. To speak briefly, this is my opinion about the place and presence of the body and blood of the Lord.

He continues by acknowledging the adversaries' charge, that they deal as natural philosophers (as to their definition of a body and its application to the glorified Jesus Christ), and should rather submit their reason to the mystery of the divine power. (2) But, Martyr argues, we simply follow the testimony of Scripture, and to follow nature where it does not contradict this, is not unworthy of theology, "For nature has God as its author and defender". Thus there is no need to fly to the divine omnipotence. He cites especially the Resurrection narratives, and the promise of Christ's Return (Matt. 28.6, Acts 3.21). This echoes the thought of the closing paragraphs of the Treatise De Resurrectione:

Truly the grounds of nature are not to be made over, except when they withstand the Word of God ... But we will follow the teaching of holy Scripture, which, wherever it speaks of the body of Christ, always attributes unto Him a place ... But I withdraw myself to Scripture, which allows so great a conjunction between a place and a body comprehended in it, that when the place is removed, it forbids the thing placed ... places also pertain to the eternal felicity in the kingdom of God.

This Scriptural basis of the reality of Christ's humanity, and its continuation in His resurrected and glorified body is the power behind Martyr's refusal

1. Ad amicum quendam, from Zürich, May 24, 1562, L.C. 1144.
2. Gardiner had used the same argument (Def., Obj. 7). But for Martyr, the Christian's "reason" is "reason formed by the Word and Spirit of God", for "human reason will never be sane and right unless it is formed by the Word of God" (in Arist. Eth. 267, 290).

to compromise with his Lutheran opponents. Moreover, since Christ in the Transfiguration gave "A pattern of blessed bodies", and in the Resurrection is "the image and similitude of our resurrection", ⁽¹⁾ therefore we cannot make an exception of the new humanity of Christ.

In this connection, his treatment of the problem of the rapture of Elijah and Enoch has relevance.

Yet many in this our time count heaven as a kind of spiritual and incorporeal place of the blessed, wholly everywhere. But this is nothing else than to mingle the highest with the lowest, the lowest with the highest. Leaving this Ubiquitous and fictitious heaven, we say not that the seats of the blessed are bodiless, but are spread widely and extensively beyond the compass of the stars, and beyond the firmament itself ... Nor are the seats of the blessed appointed to be in those visible heavens: for Christ is said to have ascended above all heavens. (in II Reg. 2.11)

To take up Elijah and Enoch into "an Ubiquitous heaven" is to send them into "Utopia, which is in no place". If they retain their bodies, they must occupy a place:

all things created are defined and distinguished by a certain place, although after their own manner. For bodies are corporeally in a place: but spirits are, as the Schoolmen say, definitively, since they have a finite substance and nature ... To be everywhere is attributed to God alone. ⁽²⁾

1. De Resurr. 64.

2. Ibid. The relation of this "place" of Elijah and Enoch to the "bosom of Abraham" wherein the O.T. saints dwelt until the resurrection of Christ, is not made too clear, but the determinative principle is that none attained unto the highest heaven until Christ the first fruits. We ought to compare the parallel passages, in I Cor. 10.11, where he warns us to beware of too close investigations in such "questions that are infinite and unprofitable", the leading of the devil as he seeks to have us neglect "the many clear and manifest things in the holy scriptures, concerning faith, hope and charity"; and especially in Rom. 8.23 ('the redemption of our body'): concerning the manner of change in all things, "all these things are obscure and uncertain ... (perhaps) figurative speech ... when all things shall end, the state of creatures shall be disturbed". The principle here is that "there shall be a certain analogy" between our glorified bodies and "the elements". This is because they were bound for our sin, and in the blessing will still be related to our being. But immortality is not a "constituted" element in anything, but "the liberal and mere gift of God". Finally, the future is simply "the kingdom of Christ, which He now exercises in the Church, and which in the day of judgment he will show forth with great power".

What is at stake here, then, is the ultimate significance of body, redemption as the new creation, and this as proceeding from, and guaranteed by, the new humanity of the Risen Lord Jesus Christ. ⁽¹⁾ The Resurrection and Ascension are decisive, and lead to the necessity of speech that may be called spatial or geometrical. The qualification that the ultimate reality is "beyond" such spatial categories does not invalidate the basic truth of these categories. Finally, then, Christ "fills all things" by the Holy Spirit. ⁽²⁾ The "moment" of the Ascension is determinative for the doctrine of the presence of Christ - Pantachus, however, speaks of an invisible ascension of the humanity of Christ at the moment of the incarnation. ⁽³⁾ Orothetes denies this as rendering vain the visible Ascension of scripture (frustra visibilibus ascendebat) - it is this doctrine that destroys the "figment of ubiquity". The "reign and glory" of Christ will come only at His appearing for judgment.

-
1. This is what is always at stake, as Peter Martyr recognized as early as his first written work, Una Semplice Dich. son. gli XII Art. (1544): "che con risusciteranno non siano per havere carne, ossa, sangue, distinte membra, et finalmente vero corpo, perche senza dubbio vi rimarra à la proprieta, et verità della natura humana, ma lo chiama spirituale, perche quel cotanto nobile et eccellente essere non procedere à da principio terreno come è l'human seme, ma da vertu di spirito di Dio ..."
 2. He reinforces his argument with reference to the work of Bullinger (De mansionibus coelestibus): Christ fills all things with the abundance of the charismata et dona of his Spirit. (Dial. 60, 84)
 3. in memento incarnationis - 91B.

The Presence in the Supper.

What is the real significance of this debate? First, Peter Martyr is willing - we may think too willing, as Zwingli was with Luther - to meet Brentius on his own ground of the peculiar problem of the presence in terms of bodily circumscription. For these spatial-geometrical terms and categories are essentially those of the ubiquitists' own making, and not central for the Reformed position. On this level of argument, Martyr argues that Christ's glorified body is substantially "above" the creaturely realm, which includes the elements of the sacraments. On such a basis he seeks to prove the impossibility of a consubstantial presence. Here his arguments, like those on the similar philosophical level against transubstantiation, can become as pedantic as those of his opponent.

But there is a deeper level to his thought, one that has ultimate significance for his doctrine of the presence of Christ. Just as against transubstantiation his real argument rested upon the analogical nature of the Sacrament, deriving from his Christological thinking, so here against ubiquity his decisive doctrine is not that of the locus of the body of Christ, but the prior and fundamental doctrine of union with Christ as the content of justification, and the end of that sanctification which comes by the Holy Spirit's instrumental use of consecrated elements.

Let us explain the reasons for such a view. First, Ortheses always insists that it is Pantachus who is choosing the categories for the discussion. For ubique is by definition an adverb of place. The distinction within Ubiquity

of Local, Repletive and Personal^S (1) is nonsense - how can there be a personal presence if it is not repletive? For Pantachus argues:

For God who alone is everywhere, never is so locally, but only repletively. But after the Son of God had united humanity with himself, that humanity assumed by the Son of God into the unity of person, must of necessity be everywhere, by a personal ubiquity. (Dial. 58C)

Unless we are to make a new grammar, therefore, we cannot disjoin this adverb of place from locality (cur ab eius significatione localitatem abjungitis?).

And this question of locale receives its answer in the doctrine of Ascension, which means that just as according to a certain manner of presence the body of Christ was removed from the Apostles, so is it removed from us.

The body of Christ is so contained in heaven that it no longer dwells upon earth. (Corpus Christi sic coelo contineri ut non amplius in terris versetur). (73B)

It is at this point that Orothetes introduces his qualification of the whole level of discussion we have been considering: The Session at the right hand of God does not explain the Ascension. (2) It is a false reasoning on the part of Pantachus which says that the right hand of God, being immense, is everywhere,

1. Docendi gratia triplicem Ubiquitatem statuamus. Localem, Repletivam et Personalem (58B). In 99B, P^a teaches a "personal ubiquity" as the presupposition of a "definitive presence" in the Supper. This accords with Luther's own (scholastic) distinction, Local (Circumscribed), Definitive and Repletive. The last may be attributable to the Body of Christ, but it is the Definitive mode by which He is present in the Supper. In debate with Zwingli, Luther's basis was (1) a divine— or spirit— flesh of Christ ('Gottesfleisch, Geistesfleisch') and (2) a 'right hand of God' everywhere, not "a golden chair beside the Father" (cf. A. Barclay, op. cit. for an able summary). Brentius, at one time close to Calvin in theology (Barclay, p 64 quotes Ebrard: "What is embryonic in Zwingli came to its fruition in Brenz ... In Brenz we find first that teaching which Bucer shared, and which later reached its full development in Calvin and Melancthon"), swung to Luther's position in the debate with Martyr and Bullinger (cf. Dial., Loc. III) - quod est cum deitate personaliter et inseparabiliter unitum shares divinity's ubiquity, as faith in God's omnipotence asserts against reason.
2. Sedere ad dexteram patris non explicat ascensionem. Dial. 77B—the body assumpti super omnes coelos exprimere videatur, demonstreturque humanitatem Christi non tantum sublatam super omnes coelos, verum et apud Deum omnipotentem supremam dignitatem et gradum esse assequutam.

therefore Christ who sits at that right hand, is everywhere. For what does this Session signify? Two things, the power of God's creativity and governance, and the greatest and perfect blessedness. Just as the power of a king extends beyond his own body, so the power or virtue of the Body of Christ extends beyond its own circumscribed being. The circumscription is no hindrance to communion with Christ; to argue from the one to the other is to confuse the categories. There is a certain power of faith, by which things distant are made present to the spirit and soul of the believer - a presence of faith.⁽¹⁾

The decisive question to be asked Pantachus is, do the "impious and destitute of all faith" receive the presence of Christ in the Supper? Pantachus answers, Why not? It is a substantial presence. But Orothetes teaches that the wicked, although they may partake of the outward sacrament, are excluded from the matter of the sacrament.

The nourishment of the body and blood of the Lord has eternal life joined with it in an invisible bond, as John 6 most clearly teaches.
(100E)

Orothetes calls as his special witness Augustine, in many passages,⁽²⁾ and also other of the Fathers. But his last witness is Philip Melancthon. Orothetes states that Philip is worthy to be compared with the Fathers - and even with Luther, as could Zwingli and Oecolampadius. Melancthon emphasizes the fact that Christ has been lifted up (sursum), and is not to be sought on earth.⁽³⁾

It is ^{on} this level of debate that Orothetes introduces the teaching that there is a twofold mouth of the faithful (Duplex est os fidelium):

-
1. 93E.
 2. Peter Martyr's use of Augustine is abundant, but he especially cites two passages. One, Quid pares dentem et ventrem? Crede et maducasti. (Joan. Tract. 25) The other is De Civ. Dei 21.25, concerning the necessity of abiding in Christ before there can be a partaking of His body.
 4. He cites Melancthon's Response to questions of Prince Frederick, 1559.

The faithful are supplied with a twofold mouth. The one is physical, by which profane or common drink and food are conveyed into the stomach, to feed and nourish the body itself. They have another mouth - not indeed in a proper sense, but so-called by a particular metaphor, because the enlightening and edifying of faith belong to the rational part of the soul, and they receive by it heavenly nurture (coelestis alimonia) to the soul, and finally divine renewing of the whole man. Consequently, when they approach the sacred Meal, with the natural mouth they take up bread and wine, but with the mouth of the soul or of faith they grasp those things which are signified to them by the Lord's institution, the body and blood of the Lord, I say, as they were given on the cross for our salvation. Hence that mouth of the soul is a thing not earthly, but spiritual, so that eating is not literal but metaphorical. So that to eat the body of Christ and to drink his blood, is truly and effectually to believe Him to have been delivered for our sakes by God to the death of the Cross. (127 C-E)

Now faith, says Orthetes, is wholly a work of God; yet he uses instruments - ordinarily, the outward Word and the Sacraments - and what He effects by these is an increase in our union with Christ.

While we live, faith is not absolute, but has continual accession; and our union with the body of Christ is not so intimate that it never requires to be made deeper (coniunctio nostra cum Christi corpore non est adeo intima, quin semper illam oporteat interiorem fieri). Wherefore in eating and drinking, when we celebrate the Lord's Supper, faith is heightened more and more, and grows (accenditur magis quam magis, et crescit fides), and is rendered so much the more a partner of its object, I mean the body and blood of Christ, and we are revived the more by that spiritual nourishment. (127 F-G)

"A partner of its object" - this is the effect of faith, and only in terms of this union with Christ can the problem of "what presence of the body of Christ is in the Supper?" be approached. This is not "an empty game of vacant signs", because Christ has joined Himself to these signs and so

while we eat the broken bread in the sacred Meal, and do so faithfully, the body and blood of the Lord is more and more spiritually communicated to us. (1280)

Because of the "inner office of the Holy Spirit", these elements become "effective instruments". The distance of place is overcome by the power of faith, and Christ in His humanity is joined to us "in a vivifying union".

The Lord's Supper is a thing heavenly and spiritual, not human and carnal. Therefore the faithful, while they communicate, by the power of the Holy Spirit who is operative in them through the Word and symbols of this mystery, are carried upwards in mind above all heavens, where they delight in Christ himself (Christo reipsa praesentia fruuntur), particularly in what pertains to his humanity, which they behold and contemplate, inasmuch as this Man was delivered to the cross for their salvation, a price most acceptable to God. Now you see on what grounds we claim the presence of the body of Christ in the sacred Meal. (130E)

This is the "fruit and utility" of the new humanity of Christ. (1) The "real presence" in the Sacrament is not the philosophical question of the ability of Christ's Body to visit creaturely elements, but the theological question of the miracle of grace by which the Holy Spirit unites believers to Jesus Christ Himself. The Dialogue ends on a rather plaintive note:

Ord. I pray for you a better mind and saner doctrine.

Pan. Indeed I ignore your prayer. I seek this much, that as regards the matter of the sacrament, you should hold with Luther, and as regards our revered ubiquity you should be hereafter more correct in experience and in speech.

CRITICAL NOTE.

What was the real issue at stake in the unhappy controversy which so divided Lutheran and Reformed in these times? Although we may lament the Lutheran preoccupation with questions of causality, we must acknowledge the truth for which they struggled. The subsequent debate of the 16th-17th Cs. shows that what was involved was the fundamental problem of theology: the meaning of

ὁ λόγος ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ of John 1.14. Patristic theology had summarized

-
1. cf. Def. 722: "We confess that Christ is not only represented to us there but also given as the matter and in truth: and not only ... what pertains to the divine nature and grace and Spirit, and other heavenly gifts, but also to the human nature of Christ itself".

the problem in the terms $\lambda\nu\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\omicron\iota\delta$ and $\epsilon\nu\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\omicron\iota\delta$. In a penetrating analysis of the problem debated, K. Barth (Kirchliche Dogmatik I.2, 1938, sect. 15.2, 'Wahrer Gott und Wahrer Mensch', pp 145-187) interprets these as negative and positive principles. 'Anhypostasie' means (p 178) that the human nature of Christ had its power of assumption of being (Dasein, subsistens) in the being of God ('in der Seinweise (Hypostase, "Person")') but not in and for itself: it has no separate being apart from "its concrete being in the being of God in the event of unio - it is $\lambda\nu\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\omicron\iota\delta$." On the other hand, 'Enhypostasie' signifies the positive: the union gives the humanity a certain being of its own" and so it has a concrete separate being. It is $\epsilon\nu\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\omicron\iota\delta$.

Luther derived from the hypostatic union the stress upon the $\epsilon\nu\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\omicron\iota\delta$, to the detriment of the $\lambda\nu\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\omicron\iota\delta$. To the question of the revealed being, ('Und damit aus der Offenbarung ein Offenbarsein?') he answered, "The flesh of Christ ... exists as such the only power of the divine Word". This became in Lutheranism (e.g. Quenstedt) a doctrine of the reversal (Umkehrung) of the natures: "as the manhood is only through the Word and in the Word, so also the Word has reality only through and in the manhood". As Barth points out, this denies the reality of "the freedom, majesty and glory of the Word of God". Accordingly, Reformed theology stressed this latter side of the hypostatic union: even while in the flesh, the Word remained in His own nature outside (extra) the flesh. Thus Calvin (Inst. II. 13.4) denies any "inclusion" of the Word in the humanity, since His descent mirabiliter to union does not imply a relinquishing of His heavenly rule or "filling all things" as He had ab origine. The Lutherans branded this teaching extra Calvinisticum, even though (p 184) it actually continued the old Christology, and did not imply a complete separation of the divine from the creaturely-human. It opposed, not the totus totus intra carnem but the

nunquam et nusquam extra carnem. For Luther threatened to lose the reality of the λόγος ὁσαυτὸς in the reality of the λόγος ἑσαυτὸς.

We may compare this analysis with Heppe's (Reformed Dogmatics, E.T. 1950, Ch. 17, 'The Mediator of the Covenant of Grace or the Person of Christ').

"Christ's human nature had hypostatic subsistence only by its being taken up into the hypostasis of the Logos" (p 416). His Reformed sources are significant: e.g. Alsted (417), "Christ's human nature never subsisted per se but has always been an instrument ἐνυπόστατον ἐν τῷ λόγῳ"; Heidegger (428), "the human is per se ἀνυπόστατος and becomes ἐνυπόστατος in the λόγος".

In approaching the problem as that of positive and negative principles deriving from the unio hypostatica, Barth is not being merely dialectical, but is replacing the static meaning of the ἐγένετο by the dynamic. The history of the controversy would suggest that it was the static view which prevailed on both sides, and that the truth actually involved both emphases. But was this true of the original Reformation personages? We have sought to show that Peter Martyr's teaching on the unio hypostatica (e.g. Chapters 1 and 3) preserves the dynamic of the ἐγένετο while allowing, perhaps even more pointedly than Calvin, not only a communicatio nominis but also a "real presence" of totus Christus as the Divine-human Person. In this sense at least he maintains the Scriptural dynamic. But that elements in his teaching, as in Calvin's, contributed to the static separation of the emphases by later Calvinists cannot be denied. Indeed, it is no light question whether the Reformers really appreciated the Lutheran position, except perhaps Martin Bucer. The debate with Brentius, therefore, while giving cause for grief over such deep internal strife at the heart of the Reformation, should serve to force us back from such problems to that which defied and denied their categories, the deeper mystery of the Person of Jesus Christ.

CHAPTER IX : THE EUCHARIST AND TROPISM.

Peter Martyr spent little time in dealing with the Anabaptists, except to note their presence as the delimiting factor in the Reformation - for instance, when treating of War, he states

The Anabaptists, the furors and plagues (furores et pestes) of our time, say absolutely that it is not lawful to war. (in I Sam. 3, De Bello)

In regard to the Sacrament, they occupy a similar position - a rationalized doctrine which was termed tropism, because they held that the sacramental signs were simply "tropes" or bare signs of their signification. This may best be summed up in relation to two questions which are basic for Martyr, first as to the nature of the sacramental signs - the "mutation" of which we have spoken already - and second, as to the purpose of the Sacrament, its relation to sacrifice.

A. THE NATURE OF THE SIGNS.

The Means of Grace as Effective Signs.

Peter Martyr was too much involved in the Swiss Reformation to mistake the sacramental teaching of Zwingli for the tropism of the Anabaptists. Indeed, he says of his own sacramental teaching, in the Oxford Disputation, that it was simply what Bullinger had been teaching.⁽¹⁾ But he treats the so-called "Zwinglian" view in a few sections of the Treatise, with the initial qualification that Zwingli himself does not speak "so slenderly" of the signs as is supposed. His treatment serves a practical purpose - to refute the Romanist charge that the Reformed doctrine of the sacraments is mere tropism. In the struggle with transubstantiation, the terms employed often approached the other extreme; but Peter Martyr makes

1. See App. D for the question of Martyr's relation to Bucer and to Bullinger.

clear his own position as follows:

adversaries say, If you remove Transubstantiation and real presence, it follows of necessity that nothing but signification is left in the sacrament. I answer that they are Anabaptists, who would have this sacrament to be nothing else than a badge and profession of our mutual society through love: they take no account of the Holy Spirit, Whom we affirm to be in this sacrament. (Disp., Praef.)

The problem is, if the true eating of the body of Christ is a matter of the Holy Spirit, as John 6 teaches, can the sacramental signs mean anything more than a partial and temporary means by which a weak Christian calls to memory the Death of Christ? Now Peter Martyr deals with this question by teaching, as we have already indicated, a sacramental mutation which can be said to come to the elements because of the change in believers through the means of the sacrament. They are "not dumb, but speaking signs". To say, as they do, that the words "remembrance" and "show forth" imply an absence of Christ's body, confuses the issue. For the absence refers only to such a corporeal-natural Body as the transubstantiators demand. But

when received by faith it is not understood to be wholly absent, although He remains in heaven regarding His nature and substance. For He is spiritually eaten, and truly joined with us. (Tract. 77)

Moreover, the similes they cite "could not agree with this mystery". They suggest for example, an absent friend made "present" when we think of him, or a mirror which reflects the likeness but not the actual presence. The difference is manifest -

For a friend being comprehended in thinking and conversant in mind, does not change him that thinks of him; he does not nourish his mind, nor restore his flesh so that it is capable of resurrection.

Indeed, the doctrine of the signs used is derivative from the doctrine of their effect; tropism means that the content of justification is not understood as union with Christ, so that "growth in grace" is but a mental process, and sanctification may be defined anthropocentrically. Those who talk most of "the Spirit"

often deny Him room to breathe.

Peter Martyr wants to define clearly the effect of the sacramental eating, and then the true being of the signs will be clarified.

For the presence which we confess of the Spirit of Christ has the power of the Holy Spirit joined with it, which unites us most closely unto Him.

Union with Christ as the work of the Holy Spirit - this is the "third conjunction with Christ" which they miss, teaching only two - one natural, by the Incarnation, and the other by faith, when we apprehend that He was crucified for us. This third is the decisive one, however,

into which we enter with Christ in the eating of Him spiritually.

Faith makes a thing "thoroughly present", so that we are joined unto the whole.

Christ not only mentally and by memory but in a real union, in the realm of being.

Now Zwingli, he says, does not in his writing make the signs "vain or frustrate". But his followers often do, seldom mentioning any sacramental changing of the elements, which is no light matter. Such a change is implied in the O.T. idea of holy vessels, in St. Paul's terminology of "the cup of the Lord", and in the frequent use of this doctrine in the Fathers. ⁽¹⁾ Here Martyr teaches a threefold conjunction in the sacrament:

while we communicate, Christ is joined to us with an excellent union, as He that dwells in us and we in Him; who also in the next degree is joined with words, by signification; thirdly He is also coupled with signs, again by signification - which conjunction, however, is less than that which belongs unto words. And from the former, the conjunction with words, the signs take their sacramental signification.

The determinative factor is the efficacy of the Sacrament, according to

1. This part of the argument is from Tract. 79-81.

which:

The symbols are not only signs but instruments of the Holy Spirit
(Symbola non tantum signa sunt, sed instrumenta sunt spiritus sancti).
 (Def. 82)

The institution of the Lord and the power of the Holy Spirit mean that God con-
 descends to work mightily through these consecrated elements.

But these symbols are through the words of God and His institution
 made signs and mysteries of our salvation. (in I Cor. 10.16)

We often call the signification of the symbols potent and effective.
 Why not? For the Sacraments are not common or familiar signs, but
 instruments of the Holy Spirit. (Def. 730)

Martyr contrasts these effective signs proper to mysteries⁽¹⁾ with the signific-
 ation of "Tragic and Comic"⁽²⁾ or of "images and statues".⁽³⁾

so the bread of the Eucharist is called the body of Christ, because it
 signifies this - not, doubtless, by a common signification such as is
 used on a stage or theatre, but effectual, since the Holy Spirit uses that
 instrument to stir up faith in us, by which we may apprehend the promised
 participation of the Lord's body. (Conf. Argent. 1556)

We do not teach that the holy mysteries are a kind of common picture or
 promissory note! (sancta mysteria esse vulgares quasdam picturas, aut
syngraphas). (Def. 200)

It was for this reason, Martyr says, that Christ used Is instead of Signifies in
 His words of institution.⁽⁴⁾ There being no special word to indicate this genus
significationis, Christ called the Sacrament of His body 'My body':

Why did Christ use the verb substantive Est rather than the verb
Significat? ... lest we should suspect it to be a light and common
 signification. (Def. 71)

In these terms Martyr can grapple with Gardiner's charges that his teaching is

1. Epit. (Verba Coenae ...): "such as were accustomed to be assigned in other
 mysteries".
2. Tract. 44: it is our "secret and unspeakable union" with Christ that proves
 the effective nature of the symbols.
3. in I Cor. 10.1: "not indeed commonly, as an image or statue represents
 Caesar, but we say it is a sign potent and effective".
4. Ibid.: "lest it be thought a common conjunction of this communion with the
 cup".

merely "figurative". If by figure is understood "an empty and vain sign", then Martyr agrees that no such figure is in the Eucharist! (1)

What, pray you, do you call an arid figure? Surely not the bread?
(Def. 56)

Therefore Martyr advises that the Minister should

weigh the nature and dignity of the mysteries, lest he should think that he gives bread, wine or water as naked elements of the world ... Nor let him delay examining and searching those to whom he will distribute the Sacraments, that if he perceive them to be dogs, he may remove them from him. (in I Cor. 4.2)

The Office of the Holy Spirit.

Martyr's teaching may be summed up in regard to the work of the Holy Spirit: it is because it is the Spirit who works here that (1) a substantial change is not necessary or proper; and (2) an effective change is necessary and proper. The error of Papist and Lutheran lay in failing to understand the centrality of the Holy Spirit in the Christian life, and seeking communication through some means other than His office. The error of the Anabaptist or "Zwinglian" lay in failing to understand the Holy Spirit's use of instruments, based on the Christological analogy and decisiveness of the Incarnation. He refused to make any sign an effective one, and ultimately threw into doubt the Incarnation:

they have not always applied to (signs) that efficacy which is due to them: for these are not made common signs but such as may mightily and effectually stir up the mind ... these things are not attributed unto the elements for their own sake, but because of the institution of the Lord, the power of the Holy Spirit, and the plain sense of the words. ... If they demand, how may I know that the Holy Spirit works here? It is easily answered, because it is al-

1. Def. 810; cf. 52: the Eucharistic figures are especially nuda frigidaque if they do not give the spiritual apprehension of Christ - precisely what transub. omits! What a terrible calumny on both Martyr and Zwingli to declare as does the 'Dict. de Theol. Cath.' (loc.cit.), "Il considèrait, en effet, à la suite de Zwingli, les sacraments ... comme de purs symboles d'union Chrétienne".

ready ordained that this is a spiritual eating. But how shall we eat spiritually without the Holy Spirit? Regarding the institution of the Lord, there is no doubt: and of the efficacy of the Word, the scriptures speak everywhere ... (Romans 1.16) ... that God will declare His power by this instrument (Gospel) - and what else is the Eucharist than the visible Gospel or Word?⁽¹⁾

The Holy Spirit brings belief unto men, "but He uses the instrument of words, and of sacraments which are sensible words of God" - this is the key to Martyr's theology, and not merely to his doctrine of sacrament. His theology may rightly be termed a theology of the Holy Spirit, for He is central in all Christian knowledge and life. It is on this basis that he demands recognition of the change in the elements - their analogical power is not a thing of human making, arising in our cognition, and therefore external to the sacrament; it comes with the very givenness of sacraments and depends upon the Holy Spirit:

Wherefore this changing must not be removed from bread and wine, by which they are made effectual signs of the body and blood of Christ, that is, by which the Spirit of the Lord works mightily and not meanly in us, so that we are endued with faith and godliness.⁽²⁾

Here again the effect of the Holy Spirit is summed up as our union with Christ:

Indeed He is joined to us, but is every day more closely joined, and while we communicate is more and more united unto us ... We, by the Communion, are incorporated into Christ ... For although we affirm that the apprehension or holding fast the body of Christ is done by faith, yet upon this apprehending follows an effect, even a true union with Christ, not feigned or imagined.

Christ makes "a certain entrance" into us, nourishing us - and mentally-present things do not nourish. Peter Martyr is explicit here -

all this that we teach is spiritual - and yet no feigned thing, for imagined sights, idols, or fictitious things do not nourish the mind, as here we are certain happens ... these signs both signify and offer,

-
1. Quotations are from Tract. 80, 81.
 2. cf. Tract. 49: "by an effective and most vehement force of the Spirit"; 60: "The Holy Spirit is the chief in this matter"; 64: "For all depends on the institution of the Lord and the working of the Holy Spirit".

and most truly exhibit the body of Christ, although this is spiritually, to be eaten with the mind, and not with the mouth of the body.

This most important question of "both signified and offered" will concern us in the final Chapter. Both extremes, transubstantiation and tropism, err in taking the sense of the offering or exhibiting of the body of Christ in a quasi-physical sense. The one utterly embraces this sense, the other utterly rejects it. Martyr's doctrine of the Holy Spirit allows him to escape this false antithesis, and see that the unity of physical and spiritual in the sacrament is one maintained by the Holy Spirit and therefore real as He maintains a relation of analogy to eyes of faith, and not real as a relation of simple identity (as transubstantiation ultimately implies), or of simple difference (as tropism implies).

Lastly, we have shown that great heed must be taken lest that which we speak of spiritual eating be understood as if it destroyed the truth of His presence ... For wherever the faithful are, they apprehend that Christ had a true body given for us, and so they eat him by faith. (Tract. 81)

But if we have regard to the work of faith (opus fidei spectamus), the true body of Christ is perceived to be the thing itself spiritually in the Supper. (Def. 267)

B. THE PURPOSE OF THE SACRAMENT.

In one passage Peter Martyr lays bare a most fruitful analysis of the two errors attendant upon the doctrine of the sacraments.

And so one will establish the nature of Sacraments rather in the receiving^{of} what God gives us than in the giving of what we offer unto God. For more excellent are the things God shows us, than what we offer. Certainly we give ourselves as living sacrifices, as we die unto sin; we give confession and praises, and other things like that. But what we receive through faith are Christ, remission of sins, grace and eternal life. Against these we may sin in two ways ...
(in I Cor. 10.16)

The first of the "two ways" is that of the Romanist, with his sacrifice of the

altar, "which is wholly repugnant to the ratio of a Sacrament". The second is as follows:

And the Anabaptists sin, who make the Sacraments only outward tokens (tesseractae), in which they publicly declare their faith, and are distinguished from the rest of men, promising a holy life, and manners worthy of a Christian. Whence these too seem to place the whole weight in our oblation (in oblatione nostri totum ponere). But if so, there ought not to be so much giving of thanks. For we do not give thanks for that which we give, but receive.

The striking thing here is Martyr's conclusion that both extremes imply the identical basic error: turning the sacrament (something received from God) into sacrifice (something given to God).⁽¹⁾ Ultimately, Anabaptism means the same legalism, with its work-righteousness and its characteristic rite of Sacrifice, of which Romanism is guilty. The forms differ, for they stand on opposite sides of the Reformed position; yet the error is the same in each, and reaches its clearest expression in their turning the sacrament of the Eucharist into a sacrifice, giving it into the hands of men.

And whereas this meat is called by Paul, spiritual, it is signified that sacraments are no common signs, as though none of these things which are signified were received: for then they should be but external and earthly meats, and not spiritual. Further, God mocks not, nor deceives, that he would promise anything in the sacraments which he will not perform by any means. Yet neither is there need of a metamorphosis (which they call transubstantiation) to the end that the

1. A further proof of this significant teaching is Martyr's attitude to the Baptismal vow (in Rom. 6.3; De Vot. 1433, 1553ff, 1369, 1576). Romanism had related the vow (of being joined (nomen dare) to Christ) to celibacy, making faith ambiguous, inasmuch as a further degree of faith could be attained in the post-Baptismal vows. On this subject Martyr agrees that in Baptism "we are separated from satan and join ourselves to Christ", vowing never to fall away to the devil. But this is not to vow properly, since in Baptism the chief point is the confession of one's faith: fidem posse intelligi professionem in Baptismo. Thus the Fathers understood by votum only aut preces aut vehemens desiderium. For the principle to be followed is this, Sacraments are things promised by God, not vowed by men. Might we not conclude that in Baptism as in the Eucharist, the two opposite errors resolve into a basic legalism in which man becomes the controlling person in the action?

sacrament should become spiritual food. We ought not to confound the nature of the signs with the things signified. Let us follow the mean and sound way; and let us judge honorably of the sacraments - not thinking them to be things altogether empty of spiritual good, nor so joining the signs with the things that they pass wholly into them. It is enough to appoint a profitable and most excellent signification, by which the faithful mind, through believing, may be made partaker of the things signified.

(in I Cor. 10.3)

CHAPTER X : THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

A : SACRIFICE AND SACRAMENT.

Now a sacrifice is a religious act, since it pertains to the worship (cultus) of God, and is instituted by Him that we may offer our goods to him, even for this, that he might be endowed with honour, and (as Augustine says, de Civ. Dei cap. 7) we may adhere to him in a holy society. And here we may see how a Sacrifice, properly speaking, differs from a Sacrament: since this too is a religious work, also instituted by God, that through it the promise and good gifts should be sealed and exhibited - but there we offer nothing at all unto God, but He himself proffers signs, and amplifies his gifts to us, while we receive the things offered with a sound faith.

(in Iud. 2.5)

By way of preliminary definition of the Eucharist, we set forth Peter Martyr's distinction of sacrifice and sacrament: in a deep sense they are opposites, to be judged according to their movement, whether they proceed from God to man or from man to God. In this preliminary but fundamental sense, a sacrifice is "wholly repugnant to the ratio of sacrament"⁽¹⁾

Since we have dealt at length with Martyr's analysis of this ratio of the Sacraments, we may turn at once to his further analysis of sacrifice, then to his treatment of the Mass, and so to his teaching about the Lord's Supper as the "eucharistic sacrifice" of the Christian Church.

1. in I Cor. 10.16.

Sacrifices Propitiatory and Eucharistic.

And sacrifice is divided, according to its properties: so that one kind of sacrifice is called , that is, a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and the other is called , that is a sacrifice of expiation or purging. (in Rom. 12.1)

The expiatory sacrifices of the O.T., as we have indicated in Chapter 2, were

types of that special and unique sacrifice, by which Christ Himself offered sacrifice to God, by which we are delivered. (in Lament. 2.7)

For under this head of propitiatory sacrifice,

we have but one only; inasmuch as by the death of Christ alone is the eternal Father reconciled unto us, and by the merit of His one oblation alone the elect have their sins forgiven. (in Jud. 2.5)

The sacrifices of thanksgiving (eucharistiae) may be further distinguished into their inner and outer aspects, since they are characterized by the signs and tokens of the inner gratitude unto God.⁽¹⁾ The outward signs are of no value apart from the inner gratitude, which is always pleasing unto the Father:

among outward oblations, the killing of beasts, tithes and first fruits held in times past the last place. But the chief place was given unto the obedience shown to the Word of God, love towards our brethren, thanksgiving and prayers.

On this basis Peter Martyr proceeds a further step: in the O.T. sacrifices there was a true communion with Christ, that is, these things were also sacraments. And although the ratios of sacrifice and sacrament differ, yet "one thing may be both a Sacrifice and a Sacrament". For the O.T. sacrifices

were also Sacraments, by which Christ was set forth to the old fathers to be received by them in faith, and by which they communicated before God in eating and drinking together.

1. This teaching is from in Jud. 2.5. Martyr's doctrine of O.T. sacrifice relates the sacrifices of thanksgiving to the peace-offerings (e.g. in I Sam. 1.4, 2.28, 11.15, etc.), part of which was eaten. In this class of sacrificium pacificum et gratiarum actionis, therefore, we have a striking analogy as to name, content and action, to our Eucharist.

Thus of the two kinds of sacrifice, propitiatory are related to Christ as prior types only, so that no sacrifice of that kind may be offered after His self-offering. What of the claim for the Mass, then?

they say that they offer the Son of God unto the eternal Father. And that is expressly denied in the Epistle to the Hebrews; for it teaches that all things were finished by the single oblation of Christ, which being perfect we may not renew. They will have Christ to be offered up every day: the Word of God affirms that He was to be offered up once only. (in Iud. 1.36)

To this important subject we now turn, Peter Martyr's criticism of the Mass as over-throwing this determinative distinction between sacrifices propitiatory, which are completed in the Death of Christ, and sacrifices eucharistic, which still have place in the Christian Church.

B. THE ROMAN MASS.

O thou holy Supper of the Lord, how many ways art thou here miserably dishonoured and polluted! O mass, mass, mass, what remains sound in thee? (Catech. 42)

In Missa Papistica non est Coena domini. (Def. 195)

But I affirm that it is so perverted as in a sense to agree not at all with Christ's institution, yea to be wholly contrary to it ... They may rather give any name unto it, than the Lord's Supper. (in Iud. 1.36)

Peter Martyr examines the Mass in detail, inasmuch as this is the central stronghold of Romanist error. To the English Church he writes:

But perhaps you think that the controversy about the Eucharist is a kind of small dissent, which is not so, since in it there is strife about the principal points of religion. (Epist. Eccl. Ang.)

And to Calvin about the latter's sacramental controversies, (1)

-
1. Feb. 16, 1556, L.C. 1114 - Calvin's 'Second Defence against Westphal' appeared the previous month.

I judge its manifestation to be so great a good, that without it God cannot be sincerely worshipped in His Church ... unless this fountain of many evils is abolished, there shall be lacking a great part of Christian doctrine in the Church of Christ.

There is a twofold objection to the Roman Mass. First, in its external forms, it is to be deplored as a falling away from the original simplicity of the Lord's Supper. Second, because of the doctrines of transubstantiation and propitiatory sacrifice, it is to be absolutely denied as a means of grace in the Church.

The Institution of the Lord and its Corruption.

in the sacrament of the Eucharist we must not depart from the institution of the Lord. (An in Comm. Lic. 5)

In a detailed examination of the parts of the Mass, ⁽¹⁾ Peter Martyr explains their original meaning. Certain parts of it have excellent use, notably the

Sursum corda -

to think upon no carnal or earthly thing, but wholly bend their mind unto heaven, where Christ is to be sought, and not on earth, as though He were inclosed in bread and wine.

and the Giving of Thanks -

the mystery itself of Christ's body and blood is called *εὐχαριστία* because its whole construction depends upon the giving of thanks.

Considering all its parts, Martyr concludes:

Although all these things led the Christian people away from that first simplicity of the Lord's Supper, many things being added as seemed good to various men, yet in one sense they could be allowed, and not rightly accused of superstition and idolatry ... but afterwards the Roman Antichrist corrupted everything.

1. in Iud. 1.33; cf. in I Cor. 5.5: against the claim that Missa derives from the Hebrew לֶחֶם, Martyr says it comes ab mittendo, since the faithful sent their gifts to the Table (during the Offertorium) or since the catechumens were then dismissed.

This corruption which followed the Patristic age has its source in the divorcing of Sacrament from Word, and is clearly illustrated by the use of Latin in the Mass.

For the Sacraments in those first and purer times were commonly known to all, but are unknown today (a fact to be much lamented) to the greatest part of Christians. But the use of a strange tongue has introduced this misery, which Antichrist has added to all sacred rites and ceremonies: by this it happens that the people understand nothing, and are only amazed at certain outward gestures and ceremonies, and on them place all their confidence and salvation. (1)

The key term in this debate is "edification": are the people edified by what is done? (2)

Nor are they joined together in this Society except to edify one another. (Catech. 39)

Our doctrine banishes superstition, removes idolatry, teaches the pure use of the sacraments, uses the language by which the people are edified, renders to devoted men the Word of God, frees the faithful of Christ from the elements of this world. (Def. 50)

But the Mass, he continues, has introduced shameless idolatry and untold abuses - adoration of stones, pictures, bread and wine; the use of an unknown tongue; neglect of the Word; and truncation of the elements. Yet the infant Church (ecclesia incunabilis) knew none of these - where do we read in the older writings of carrying the elements about, of lights and wax, invocations and adorations? Martyr's conclusion is, it was the new doctrine of transubstantiation which introduced the abuses; the superstitions were born of that opinion and its corporeal

-
1. in Rom. 6.2. The context is the analogical nature of Baptism. Martyr continues our quotations: "And chiefly from this too springs that mischief that infants are often baptized either at home or else in Church when none are present ...".
 2. cf. in I Cor. 14.40: "decently" means, not bells, lights, golden vessels, but holiness, modesty, "and especially edification"; in Iud. 8.24: "ecclesiastical traditions may be changed or removed, if edification require".

presence. (1)

But the old fathers distributed the sacrament in this Supper to the faithful with gravity and dignity, and afterwards burnt the remainder, as Hesychius testifies. They appointed clerics to eat what remained among themselves, somewhere or other. Women had the rest at home sometimes, as can be read in Tertullian and Cyprian. Sometimes the bread of the Eucharist is given to the sick, being carried even by children, as the Ecclesiastical History teaches ...
(Def. 51)

We have departed that Society which ... forces upon us idolatry towards bread and wine. (De Schism. 46)

In the Mass, then, we see the classic example of the way in which human invention has corrupted a Divine institution until the latter has been inverted in nature and purpose.

What is today more adorned and set forth with colours than the Mass? In it is a wonderful decking with garments, alluring songs, musical instruments, waxen lights, sweet perfume, bells ... where is even one among the miserable people who understands the causes of these signs? ... And the thing is so deformed and so greatly degenerated, that it may be counted or perceived to be anything rather than the Lord's Supper. (in I Cor. 3.12)

The simple institution, making for remembrance and communion, has become a matter of onlooking and superstition.

Christ instituted the Lord's Supper, that the Lord's death should be held in remembrance there, and the communicants be partakers of its fruit, and be joined to Christ, and always joined together among themselves with greater amity, and mortify their evil lusts, and through that heavenly meat more and more practise a new life. This is the worship which God requires of His own in this sacrament. Yet men were not content, since it was a hard thing to do, or because they always willed to add their own inventions to divine matters, and invented outward ornaments, vestments, gold, silver, precious stones,

-
1. cf. Disp. III, vs. Morg., that transub. is "the newer opinion"; in Rom. 1.16: "Why do you object antiquity to us? ... you have introduced things new"; 3.21: "in the Gospel, newness must especially be shunned"; An in Comm. Lic. 3: Deus dixit is divinity's first principle; 18: "They say that they have the consent of the Church, wherein they impudently take to themselves what is ours: since the Churches of Greece, and the whole East and universal antiquity, hold with us. For the foul mangling of the Eucharist is but lately arisen". But in the Reformed Church "we most faithfully recite the history of the Supper as delivered by the Evangelist, and what Christ did in the Supper, so do we also to the last word" (Def. 209).

wax, tapers, bells and infinite ceremonies, to set forth the sacrament by these. And they would have men stand by at their Mass, and be but onlookers and listeners, while they meanwhile mumble their prayers ... This is the profit that comes from human inventions. (in Rom. 1.21)

The great sin here is that by transubstantiation there has been a complete inversion of the sacrament, into a sacrifice of expiation, attended by the ceremonial and legal externalities which accompanied the Temple worship of the Old Covenant. These outward aspects of the Mass, therefore, indicate a deeper root to the matter.

The "Miserable Bondage".

(Paul) calls that a miserable bondage, when we take the signs for the things. In this is great offence committed these days, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist. For how many shall one find, who beholds the outward signs of this Sacrament, and calls to memory the death and person of Christ, of which most certainly they are signs? or thinks within himself that the body and blood of Christ is the spiritual food of the soul by faith, just as bread and wine are the nourishment of the body? or ponders the union of the members of Christ among themselves, and with the Head? These things are not regarded, but they cling only to the sight of the signs. And men think it is enough if they have looked on, bowed their knee, and worshipped. This is to embrace the letter ... (in Rom. 2.27)

The errors of transubstantiation have thus destroyed the analogy - the very ratio sacramenti - and turned everything upside down. Think of this, says Martyr - this food, which they surround with pomp, incense, bells and all manner of adoration, they deign to call (please God!) Viaticum, the rations of soldiers and pilgrims! ⁽¹⁾

The Mass represents the denial of the Holy Spirit, and the recourse to the dead letter of legalism and bondage. When the analogy is lost, it is inevitable that the sign should become the object of faith. Moreover, because such bondage implies "Christ in a little box" as Martyr terms it, sight has taken the place of faith, and therefore the Word of God and the response of faith are irrelevant.

For we in the sacrament venerate the body of Christ which is in heaven. But since you declare that a real and crass presence is altogether necessary, of what use can the Archetype be for that affair? (Def. 281)

For adoration belongs unto the Archetype only. Indeed, adoration of the sacrament does not yield the proper effect and utility of the sacrament, which is by eating and drinking to have union with Him. And since this Papist doctrine exposes the Church to idolatry, whereas God always recalls His Church from idolatry, it must be false. For think of the dangers attendant upon the priestly Consecration! The people worship an idol, the priests must consecrate aright, the words are muttered and not understood even if audible, the material must be such as is prescribed ... but Christ at the Last Supper spoke with words that all heard and understood, as Paul clearly relates. (1)

The two symbols of this miserable subjection to signs are the use of Latin and the withholding of the cup from the laity. These two Peter Martyr mentions often as decisively indicating how the Word of God has been set aside in this inverted rite. Indeed, Romanism proves itself sectarian in the latter regard, (2) since it comes under Cyprian's censure of the Aquarian heretics:

1. cf. An in Comm. Lic. 9: "Christian liberty consists not in this, that we may change the institutions of Christ, but in this, that Christ has reduced many ceremonies to few, and for laborious has given easy and plain, and for obscure ceremonies has set forth those that are most clear".
2. cf. the whole Treatise An in Communionem Liceat Una Tantum specie uti (in I Cor., 10.17, ff 138B-141A): the two parts of the Sacrament are parts of Christ's Word, but human sin desires to mutilate that Word - recently, at any rate, since "the Fathers greatly feared to depart from the Lord's order in this Sacrament". "They judge it a grievous error if they omit any sign of the cross or most minute kind of thing: which are nonetheless human inventions, mere absurdities and trifles (hominum inventa, merae ineptae et mugae). Why should we not rather beware lest we overlook what Christ Himself commanded in His Word?"

Cyprian blamed them because they did it against the Word of God. Today the Papists use not indeed water instead of wine, but they tear and mutilate the sacrament, and pluck away one part from the people, nor meanwhile consider what Christ taught or did, but only what some men have decreed against the Word of God. (De Vot. 1556G)

The use of Latin has no justification, either from the original institution of Christ, or from the purpose of the sacrament.

It is no part of the pastors of the Church of Christ to keep secret the words of God. (in I Cor. 14.4)

And those words, which should bring great consolation unto the bystanders, when the participation of the body and blood of the Lord is promised to them, they speak so softly, yea mutter them so darkly, that even if a man know Latin he is unable to understand them ... But in my opinion these men therefore mumble those words because they are wary lest their lies be perceived.

(An Christ. lic.)

For instance, they say "Take ye and eat" - and then only the priest communicates!

He continues:

Therefore faith has no place in those things, which they do in their Mass, since it has place only where God's Word offers itself to us ... the old pagans may with much better probability excuse and plead for their sacraments, than these men may defend their Masses ... Let them therefore cease from dandling that little daughter of theirs, and say no more that it should be taken for the institution of Christ and of His Apostles.

The Mass has become the highest mark of Papacy, and may well be called "a public profession of popery". Although ceremonies may be classed as "things indifferent", yet must the institution of the Lord be renewed, and occasion of superstition be removed entirely. In a trenchant passage depicting the contemporary situation, Peter Martyr lays bare the basic inversion which Romanism has effected:

If today, under the reign of Antichrist, some godly man should approach a sacrificing priest and say to him, 'I pray you, make me a Mass, but so that I may plainly understand the confession of sins and absolution; expound to me the praises of God which you have at the Introit of the Mass, and the Hymn, the Gloria in Excelsis, that I may worthily magnify God along with you, and give

Him thanks; neither hide from me the meaning of the prayers, that I may respond, Amen. Teach me the Epistle and Gospel, that by it I may learn wholesome doctrine and admonition from you; let us say together the creed of the catholic faith; and when you come to the blessing and consecration of the mysteries, keep me not back, for those words pertain also unto me, and in the breaking of bread and drinking of the cup, communicate with me, that we may at last give thanks unto our God. And since neither wealth nor food is lacking to you, all this you have freely received, freely bestow upon me.' He that asks these and like things from the sacrificer, I ask, how will he be received by him? He shall be excluded with taunts of Lutheranism, and the reproach of heresy shall be flung violently at him. But let there come likewise another who says, 'Come, I must hunt today, but because on this Lord's day I will not be without the Sacrament, take this money, and at some time in the morning, make me a Mass, and despatch it quickly and speedily'. Believe me, there will be no delay by the priest! Think you that this is to be a minister faithfully, in the way the Apostle commanded? I think not. (in I Cor. 4.2)

Facias mihi Missam - so the buying and selling of the sacrifice goes on, while the communication of the body and blood of the Lord is almost wholly neglected. The key to Reformation is the return to the institution of the Lord, which is above all else a communion with Him and with the brethren. Because this Meal refers to "the Kingdom of Christ" in which is no division of class or wealth, therefore it is by definition a shared sacrament.

The Papistical Mass cannot rightly be called a Supper. For Supper indicates communion: but in the Mass the sacrificers alone devour everything. (Def. 402)

This sacrament is called the Supper, because it refers to that first institution made by the Lord at supper. By which word, moreover, is designated a communion of many. (in I Cor. 11.21)

In the same context Martyr reminds us that the Early Church associated the mystery with a common meal, the convivia Christianorum or Agapae. Faction abused the gift and perverted the love-feast, so that today we have "a minimum of sacred symbols", since the purpose of the Supper is sanctification. It is to be administered both simply (according to the institution of Christ), and clearly (the words heard and the elements seen).

Just as every human art returns to the head and font for renewal, and just as Jesus Himself returned to the chief commandment of the Law, so we must return to the Lord's institution to remedy this evil. The sum of the Scriptural institution is, the Lord's Supper ought to be a common meal.⁽¹⁾ Private masses are a human invention and a new addition.

Martyr's deepest examination of the Mass is given in a Treatise entitled, 'Whether the Mass Is a Sacrifice'.⁽²⁾ He begins by noting the distinction between sacrifices propitiatory and eucharistic. The first has power to satisfy God and earn the forgiveness of sins; the latter has no such quality, but presupposes the offering of the propitiatory sacrifice, since it is offered by "those already received into favour". On this basis Martyr considers the Mass in respect of each kind of sacrifice.

The first section seeks to prove that "The Mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice", because of a difference in ratio:

Therefore as great a difference is there between a sacrament and a sacrifice as between giving and receiving, since in a sacrament we receive of God what He promised, but in a sacrifice we give and bring what He requires of us. Wherefore to speak properly, since the Lord's Supper is, as they will agree, a sacrament,^{it} cannot be a sacrifice, unless we would have giving and receiving to be the same!

Christ's offering on the Cross was "the one propitiatory sacrifice". According to the communication of names obtaining within the sacramental relation, the Lord's

1. coenam communem esse debere - in I Cor. 11.23. cf. Tract. 19: only communion "satisfies the institution of Christ"; in I Cor. 10.18: "For if the table and company, as Chrysostom says, unite us and make us intimates and friends, how much more the Sacrament?". In this regard we should notice Martyr's attitude to the problem of private communion for the sick. His basic principle is, "where many do not communicate the nature of the sacrament is not retained" (Tract. 51) and therefore such a rite outside "the holy congregation and the rite appointed by the Lord" is not properly "a just communion". However, they should receive the Sacrament "if they repeated the holy words, and if some faithful men communicated there". Elsewhere (An in Comm. Lic. 21) he states that the sick ought to receive the Communion, it being only the Papist superstition that created problems about the "remnant" of the consecrated host, etc.
2. AN Missa Sit Sacrificium, L.C. 995-999.

Supper can be called a propitiatory sacrifice - by metonymy, as Augustine said. But we are not discussing what the Supper represents, but what it "properly is". And against the claim that daily sins require daily sacrifices of expiation, Martyr stresses the "once and for all" note of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In fact, he points out, to follow Christ's example literally, as the Roman priest claims to do, one should not slay Christ but oneself! Moreover, a sacrifice must spring from an express commandment of God:

if obedience is not the root of the sacrifice, it becomes deadly unto him that offers it.

Christ's sacrifice fulfilled the O.T. priesthood, so that now we require rather

a feast prepared, of which the minister of the Church is not the offerer but the dispenser; nor has he a little altar, unless you figuratively call a table an altar. Therefore those who labour to renew the priesthood, altar and outward sacrifice, doubtless try to transform the new testament into the old.

Finally, the Patristic witness is clearly against the idea of ^rpropitiation in the Supper:

They do not speak of propitiatory but of Eucharistic, to which kind belong praises, thanksgiving, confession, alms, oblations, and especially that we give ourselves wholly unto God to be ruled and governed ... among them 'To sacrifice' signifies nothing else than to represent a sacrifice, to commemorate, to lay before the eyes, to give thanks for it.

Now Martyr moves on to the crucial point. Since the Mass has placed the whole weight upon propitiation to the neglect of eucharistia, and since propitiation has been wholly translated unto the Cross and so removed from the Church - therefore the Mass completely misses the only valid sacrifice remaining to Christians, the eucharistic!

In the Papistical Mass this Eucharistic or gratulatory sacrifice has no place. (Deinde in Missis Papisticis sacrificium hoc Eucharisticum sive gratulatorium non habet locum).

This is a terrible charge, but Martyr explains his reasons:

for those that stand by understand not what is said by the sacrificer,

so that they cannot answer 'Amen' to the praises of God and thanksgiving; he alone communicates, the others receive nothing; of offerings of alms there are scarcely any; the Lord's death is preached least of all. So it seems they have overthrown everything by their private Masses. And whereas there are two kinds of sacrifices, propitiatory I mean, and eucharistic, and they have not the propitiatory any more than we have (for Christ wholly and perfectly offered that), further they have not the Eucharistic which we have. What remains to their Mass, except that it is mere hypocrisy, and a feigned and damnable imitation of the Lord's Supper?

Thus in terms of the twofold nature of sacrifice, Martyr declares that the Mass has completely failed to fulfil the function of the Lord's Supper in relation to the role of sacrifice in the Church. What he has to say now about the positive part which the Supper plays in the Church reflects the great new element of Reformed theology. For Martyr, the Lord's Supper is the active memorial of the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, and the true sacrifice of thanksgiving which the Church is commanded to offer on that foundation.

C. THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH.

Opus fidei est gratias agere. (in I Cor. 15.57)

Nor wouldst Thou for any other cause gather Thy chosen and good people so wonderfully together, but that a true way to worship Thee ... might at length be universally known among all nations ... that we might offer Thee an acceptable sacrifice of thanksgiving. (Prayers, Ps. 50)

We sacrifice indeed ... the giving of thanks is the victim ... therefore since (thank God!) the mass has been removed, which was a superstitious and detestable sacrifice, as we declared, let us apply ourselves with all our hearts to this sacrifice alone. (Exhort. Iuven)

In this final and greatest aspect of Peter Martyr's doctrine of the sacraments we may distinguish three elements: the priesthood of Christ, the propitiatory sacrifice remembered or represented, and the eucharist or sacrifice of thanksgiving offered. The Romanist dialectic had reduced the relationship

between God and man to a simple distinction between God's offering to man, and man's (propitiatory) offering to God. The qualifying assertion that man makes his offering on the basis of faith was invalidated by the expiatory nature of his sacrifice, which meant that he was in a position to make God's own offering to Him. The determining factor in the Mass was the priestly power of consecration which gave control of the Body of God's Son. It was this sacrifice which gradually became extended over the whole fabric of Romanism until the system of work-righteousness reached logical completion - heaven was in the power of earth, the earthly activity forged the pattern for heaven to follow.

Thus the whole Biblical dimension of the sacrifice offered by responsive faith had been lost. This was recovered in the 16th C. largely through the return of the dynamic content of faith as union with Christ. The analogical or sacramental content of justification meant a complete inversion of the meaning of the life of the Church. In a clear passage⁽¹⁾ on the central problem of the authority and function of the ministry, Martyr sets forth the elements of the Reformed view.

They are called dispensers of the mysteries of God, but not of sacrifice, not sacrificers - yet not as though every kind of sacrifice were removed from them. For praises and confessions by which the goodness and mercy of God is declared, are pleasing sacrifices to God: no less are prayers, confession of sins, the offering of almsgiving, and repentance by which the heart becomes contrite and humble, and finally the sacrifice of our own bodies, which we offer to God as a living and reasonable sacrifice. We do not deny that these are made in the Church through the ministers of the Church. And in the last place is the sacrifice by which unbelievers are brought to Christ, as Romans 15 plainly teaches, in which Evangelical ministration (liturgia Evangelica) the ministers of Christ are occupied most of all. But those who favour superstition boast that they sacrifice

-
1. in I Cor. 4.1; cf. in II Reg. 2.23 (on Manuum impositio, Successio and Vestitus): the Ministry is given not with laying on of hands but with the apostolic succession of true doctrine, which reveals the Church's line of ancestry.

the Son of God, which is most absurd: because Christ offered himself, nor needed other priest. By one oblation he consummated and perfected whatever was to be done for our redemption: nor is it meet that man be held sacrificer in so great an oblation. For it always obtains that the offerer must be equal or more worthy than the thing offered: which is sacrilege to think concerning ourselves, as compared with Christ. Moreover who can offer the Son of God, since he is continually in the sight of the Father, where he is both our propitiation and our Advocate? But, if by sacrifice they understand the giving of thanks for his death, and because for our salvation he would give his body to the cross, and his blood to be shed, we do not deny such a sacrifice to be offered to God in the Lord's Supper, both through the ministers of the Church, and through all those standing by.

1. The Priesthood of Christ.

Peter Martyr distinguishes two "moments" in the priesthood of Christ: the oblation on the Cross and the heavenly intercession at the right hand of the Father.

He thought it not enough to die for us, but would also by His ministry advance our salvation. He is our bishop and priest. But the office of a bishop is both to offer sacrifice, and to pray for the people. Christ has offered Himself upon the Cross: and when He had finished that ministry, there remained another ministry, which He should exercise continually, namely to make intercession for us ... And continually by the priesthood of Christ are our sins forgiven, and we are reconciled unto God ... In the kingdom of Christ which he exercises most mightily at the right hand of the Father, all things are governed: and the prayers which He continually pours out for us are most welcome and acceptable to the Father ... Christ makes intercession to the Father, because He is always at His hand ... Therefore the Father is perpetually put in mind of the sacrifice once offered by Him, and smells the same like a sweet-smelling savour, and by that is made merciful unto us. And therefore Christ is called our mediator and advocate.
(in Rom. 8.34)

The implications of this passage alone are of the deepest significance for the doctrine of the Eucharist. How is the Cross related to the present mercy of the Father? Through the heavenly intercession of Christ Himself, answers Martyr -- Christ "puts the Father in mind" of that Sacrifice. In this same context Martyr indicates a further fruitful line of thought:

the intercession of the Son is the cause of the intercession of the Holy Spirit.

Now the Spirit's intercession, Martyr makes clear, is related to our prayers in the most significant way. On the text 'By Whom we cry, Abba, father', he points out that this prayer of Christ's ("our first-begotten Brother") becomes our own invocation by the work of the Holy Spirit. It is the Holy Spirit Who stirs us up to acknowledge our inheritance, and Who confirms our faith by these prayers. (1) Without the Spirit's testimony we should not believe our inheritance, which is presently held, but only imperfectly, awaiting its coming revelation and the perfection of its bestowal. For the Spirit is particularly the One that confirms us with hope. (2)

The intercession of the Spirit is ultimately our intercession inspired by Him: He does not properly pray unto the Father (or to the Son, as the Arians said) since He is "not less than the Father". (3) And yet our prayers are decisively related to merit, which is their root, and are of "great force", because the prayers of the Church are related through the intercession of the Spirit (through His inspiration, to speak properly) to the intercession of the Son. (4) Here we reach the heart of this doctrine of the Priesthood of Christ: the Son prays as man.

The Son prays and makes intercession for us, because He is less than the Father in respect of His humanity. The Spirit makes intercession, because He makes us to pray and cry .. 'Abba, father' ... The Son prays to God, not in that He is God, but in that He is man, and a creature ... And that those words of Paul are to be referred to the humanity of Christ, those things spoken before sufficiently declare. Paul had written before that Christ died, rose again and was carried up to heaven to the right hand of God: all such things agree not with the divine nature of Christ.
(in Rom. 8.34)

-
1. in Rom. 8. 15-16.
 2. in Rom. 8. 19-20, 24.
 3. in Rom. 8. 26-27.
 4. in Rom. 8.16.

The new humanity of Christ is the origin of His intercession to the Father, (1)
 He is "the propitiatory place itself", (2) and so:

the priesthood is translated unto Christ; He is now our high priest. (De Poenit. 26)

now also He executes before the Father the office of an intercessor and high priest. (in Rom. 4.25)

He is now able a great deal more to relieve our necessities, by the grace and power of His father, to Whom He always has such familiar access, and to Whom He continually offers prayers of particular efficacy for us, that He wins us His favour and procures us His strength. (Catech. 25)

Perhaps the most decisive aspect of this intercession of Christ is that His prayers "have satisfaction joined with them". (3) This is the difference between His prayers and ours: His cannot be repulsed. To speak of "merit" and "satisfaction" therefore, is to speak of the heavenly intercession of the New Man, and not of the work of earthly priests. This is the first and fundamental element in Martyr's doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice: the unique nature of the propitiation obtained by the eternal, continuing priesthood of Christ. On this basis the Church may build: but it has no hand in the foundation.

The earthly life of the Body of Christ works its work on this basis: its good works, for instance, mean that it has ceased from fleshly corruption to begin a new life of participation in Christ's Resurrection; its Christian friendship and brotherly love flow from His love, for this is "faithful and continuing in Christ alone"; even the death of its martyrs pleases God only on the ground that "they belong to the body of Christ and are now become His members by regeneration". (4) In short:

1. in I Cor. 11.3: Christ is caput viri as to His divine nature, but God is caput Christi as to His human. His consubstantiality with us is not denied in the Ascension.
2. in Gen. 28.12.
3. in Rom. 8.34.
4. in Gen. 12.1, in I Sam. 18.1, in II Reg. 3.27.

our gifts are acceptable unto God, when we offer them upon the rock which is Christ. There our actions are purged by the fire of the Holy Spirit, and what is in its own nature unclean is received by God as holy. (in Iud. 6.21)

Christ is not acceptable unto God for the Church's sake, but the Church is acceptable unto God for Christ's sake. (in Iud. 13.22)

Christ is not acceptable unto God for the sake of the sacrifice, but on the contrary we are acceptable unto God for the sake of Christ. (in I Cor. 5.7)

Whatever our sacrifice may be, it cannot be the offering of Christ to the Father, because He is continually with Him, the eternal Priest. ⁽¹⁾ On the other hand, some positive relation to His sacrifice is to be expected on the basis of the nature of the Church as the Body of its Head. The mystery of the Church's earthly life and activity is the mystery of the life and activity of its Head, in which it shares and which it reflects in sacramental analogy. If communion of worldly goods among the brethren is but the loving response to His communication of "His eternal and greatest goods", ⁽²⁾ how much more will the Eucharist exhibit this responsive and reflective character of the Church's service!

2. The Propitiatory Sacrifice Remembered and Represented.

If by oblation or sacrifice you understand a memorial of that sacrifice which He offered on the Cross, and the giving of thanks for that, these are not properly done by the ministers, but pertain also to all the faithful who communicate with them. The minister leads this with words, but does not celebrate the memory alone. (De Vet. 1531A)

The People of God are called unto two things that pertain to sacrifice:

first, the celebration of the memory of Christ's sacrifice (recordatio sacrificii Christi); second, the proper sacrifice of thanksgiving for that propitiation.

1. in I Cor. 4.1, 11.24. cf. on this whole subject, Wm. Manson's 'The Epistle to the Hebrews' (London, 1951), esp. Ch. 5, 'The Oblation of the Body of Christ'.
2. in Rom. 15.27 - the goods are to be distributed "by a just proportion".

The latter is the chief element in Martyr's positive teaching upon the Lord's Supper:

We count the sacrifices of Christians to be a contrite heart, prayers, thanksgiving, alms, mortification of fleshly affections, and so on. Since the abrogation of carnal sacrifices, these are left to us to offer as the fruit of our faith, and testimonies of a thankful mind. But as to placating God, Christ offered Himself once upon the Cross, nor need anyone offer Him again; for by one oblation He fulfilled all. It remains for us to embrace His sacrifice by faith, and we shall have God merciful (propitium) to us, Who of His goodness will accept through Christ the sacrifices just mentioned. (in Luc. 13.22)

Following justification, the People of God have a positive offering to make. But its nature must follow the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which affirms

one sacrifice only, and one oblation, namely the death of Christ, by which sins are blotted out and satisfaction made for men. Wherefore justification is not to be looked for by works; and it should be enough for us that the good works we do after justification are sacrifices of thanksgiving (sacrificia εὐχαριστικά) - but let us not establish them as propitiatory, for then we should do great injury to Christ. (De Iustif. 16)

Moreover, these "proper" sacrifices, summed up in the name "eucharistic" or "sacrifices of thanksgiving", are the effects of the deliberate act of the Church in recalling to mind the Death of Christ. This has been a constant element in Martyr's doctrine of the sacraments as visible Gospel, used in dramatic analogy by the Holy Spirit to life up our souls unto the heavenly Saviour. But this serves as a basis for the further, positive action of the Sacrament, the "right sacrifice" (iustus sacrificium) which is offered in the Church because Christ has instituted His memorial: (1)

the offering of prayers, thanksgiving, contrition of heart, almsgiving and continual mortification of the old man.

-
1. Def. 194: "But how can the Church be destitute of sacrifice, since it constantly worships the true and only victim, Christ, and as He instituted, commemorates Him?"

For this reason we must examine the nature of this "memorial" carefully.

The problem of the memorial of the Cross is simply whether in the Sacrament in some way or another the Death of Christ is not only recalled as memory but recalled as event, repeated and so recalled to God's mind by a priestly offering. This problem concerned the Fathers too, and Martyr sums up the teaching of Ambrose as follows:

To offer Christ, or His body, is to make a remembrance (recordationem facere) of His death, and to exhibit the same as example, and to repeat the commemoration of what was done before: thus we may be said rather to make a remembrance of a sacrifice, than to offer it. (magis recordationem sacrificii operari, quam offerre). (Def. 13)

Martyr's sacramental teaching involves the "real presence" of Christ in the action of the mysteries, and to this end he uses the words "represented and exhibited" to signify Christ's presence. (1) The critical term is repraesentare. According to Gardiner, the "representation" in the Eucharist meant that the matter itself was exhibited as present. Martyr replied to this by interpreting representation as reference to, not exhibition of, the matter of the sacrament: repraesentare means referre. (2) As a real presence to faith, however, the Body of Christ is truly "exhibited", but Martyr refuses to compromise his basic analogical doctrine of the sacrament in order to interpret "represent" as "make present" in a false way. Obviously the problem here is partly one of terminology, since Martyr constantly teaches a real presence of a real Body; his demand

1. cf. esp. the 'Propositions' from Genesis and Leviticus. A sacrament is instituted "to signify and exhibit grace"; Sacraments non modo significant sed exhibent gratiam (ex Gen. 16. 4-5); in the O.T. sacrifices Christ was "represented and exhibited" (ex Lev. 1.1,10)
2. rem ipsam praesentem exhibere - Def., Obj. 160. Gardiner stated, Ex pane fieri praesentiam corporis Christi, mutata quidem substantia, cuius tamen accidentia significant corpus Christi. Martyr replied, Repraesentare aliquando positum esse pro referre.

that sacrament be seal as well as sign implies a doctrine of representation as something more than "signification" and involving an actual "re-presentation" at least correspondent with the ratio of faith.

In relation to this central problem of eucharistic sacrifice, Peter Martyr stands by his doctrine of analogy as the sacramental ratio.

That word Repraesentare, which Tertullian uses in the same way, (Jerome) takes for this, namely to refer by some image or similitude (aliqua imagine quippiam, aut similitudine referre). (Def. 513)

Baptism exhibits faith and the Eucharist, the body of Christ. But these are not exhibited by the sacraments, but by the Holy Spirit, Who uses them as instruments. Wherefore that term is not to be taken simpliciter. For sacraments are to be referred to the ratio of instrumental cause (Sacramenta enim revocanda sunt ad rationem instrumentalis causae). (Def. 548)

It is this fundamental orientation of the Sacrament which must guide us in this question. The doctrine of analogy reminds us that we deal here not with a substance but with an action or relation, ⁽¹⁾ with a living Person Who is the Mystery we seek to "represent". When Martyr speaks of "memory" he does not mean something "bare and simple" as the "Sophist" Gardiner would make out, but a presence of Christ "with all His effects, gifts, fruits and merits". ⁽²⁾

The recordatio sacrificii must be related to the nature of the Sacrament as an instrument of the Holy Spirit. In this sense the "memorial" is not the sign of Christ's absence but the guarantee of His presence, since apart from the Spirit we do not communicate with Him. Now just here Martyr's dynamic view provides the answer to the demand for realism in the Sacrament:

In the Lord's Supper not only is the memory of Christ in regard to His

1. Sacramentum tantum esse in usu, dum re ipsa sumitur (Def. 491); "nothing without use" (Tract., Praef.); the Holy Spirit joins Himself to the elements "as efficient cause, as the other is the instrument, or seal of the promise" (Def. 14)
2. Def. 590. - the context is his exposition of Bernard's antithesis between memoria et praesentia.

death re-opened (refricare) but all the benefits which follow from that and which excel that, should be recalled. (in I Cor. 11.24)

We grant a sacrifice to be there, since there is the commemoration of a true sacrifice, and the Sacraments, that is outward symbols which are proposed, are signs of the same true sacrifice, and refer it to the communicants by the institution of the Lord. (Epit., Sent. 20)

These terms refricare and referre indicate the positive, beneficial effect of the sacramental representation. Christ Himself is present, therefore the Sacrament is the "holy of holies", ⁽¹⁾ and He sanctifies us there - but He does not redeem us at the holy Table any more than He sealed a testament in His blood at the Last Supper, which was no substitute for the Cross that lay ahead. ⁽²⁾ We are not to constitute "two sacrifices of Christ" as if the Father were not pleased by the first. ⁽³⁾ Martyr does not, however, deny a real offering of redemption to the believer in the Sacrament as in the Word, and on this basis he states:

And so that cry Oblatio is to be referred not to God but to those who with pious spirit feed in the sacrament. For to them is the remission of sins offered, (Def. 175)

Martyr supports his doctrine with extensive Patristic quotations, which he sums up as follows:

By countless Fathers we prove to be there: memory, monument, example, commemoration, thanksgiving about the offering of Christ already made on the Cross in the past; after these, that the sacrament obtains the name of the thing; nor is it granted that a proper sacrifice of Christ can be made there. (Def. 332)

The nominal communication in the Sacrament is once again Martyr's explanation of the Patristic language:

Certainly the Fathers often called it a sacrifice on account of the memory and recollection of a sacrifice (propter memoriam et recordationem sacrificii). (in I Sam. 11.15)

-
1. Def. 796.
 2. Def. 66.
 3. Def. 81.

In this same passage he continues with one of his rare references to Aquinas:

Thomas himself (83 q 3 Par. 1) asks whether the Son of God is immolated in the Mass. At length he concludes with this distinction: it is called sacrifice, because it is the memory, image, example or similitude of a sacrifice, and cites for that opinion the place of Augustine to Boniface, and in this way says the Eucharist can be called sacrificium.

In terms of the celebration of the memory, therefore, and the communication of names involved in the sacramental relationship, the Eucharist is called a sacrifice: but it has absolutely nothing to do with the slaying of Christ in its action.

Now if you can, bring forth one testimony out of the Gospel or the Apostles, from which you declare that the flesh of Christ is today offered in sacrifice for the living and the dead. (De Vot. 1531)

We know that we celebrate the memory of His sacrifice ... (but) In the Eucharist the immolation of Christ is not repeated. (Def. 7)

The Romanist identification of 'Do this' with 'Sacrifice this' (facere with sacrificare) is a frivolity, a burning of straw for wood because nothing better is available: when does one apply this interpretation? Does one sacrifice a garment when one makes it? or a fire, when one makes it? What did Christ sacrifice in the Last Supper? What oblation, what blood? For He said, 'Take, eat, drink, do this that I have said (namely eat and drink) for a remembrance and monument of My death'. (1)

The Fathers, on the basis of the communication of names in the Sacrament, called the Supper 'sacrifice' and 'immolation'. But since Scripture does not use this word in any sense as applied to the Supper, Martyr refuses to do so. Moreover, he complains that such language on the part of Patristic and Scholastic writers

did not edify the people, but drove them to pagan and Jewish rites, when from a blind and foolish zeal they borrowed both altars and other rites. (in I Reg. 13.1)

1. in Iud. 13.16; cf. in I Cor. 11.24 concerning facere and sacrificare.

The word "altar" receives a good deal of consideration from Martyr, since it is a prominent term in Patristic writings.

It is also to be noticed that when the Lord's Supper is celebrated, the holy table is not properly to be called an altar, although the Fathers used that word indiscriminately; but when they did this, the people believed that holy table to be no less a symbol of Christ than the altar of the Hebrews ... since we no longer have an altar, that kind of figure and symbol should not be found among us. (Def. 173)

Much more wisely did some of the Fathers instead of Altar put Table, or in Greek $\tau\omicron\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\alpha$, from which the faithful took symbols of the Eucharist. (in I Reg. 13.1)

The Church is centred around a Table, from which Christ spreads out the commemoration of His sacrifice, thanksgiving for it and its fruit. (1) The Church is

less destitute of priests since Christ Himself is its Priest, and therefore

In the Christian Church they have no altar proper ... We rather have tables, since we see that Christ instituted the mystery of the Eucharist not at an altar but at a table. (Def. 710)

"Table" is also an allegory, from which we learn of that pleasure and conviviality that Christ offers us. (2) But decisively, Martyr states:

Now Altar refers to outward sacrifice: but because this has place among us no longer, since we offer no more outward sacrifices of beasts slain, our sacrifices being nothing else than prayers, praises, thanksgivings, mortification of the flesh and almsgiving: therefore since the correlative, as the Logicians say, of an Altar is removed, neither can the thing itself remain. (in I Reg. 13.1)

Peter Martyr's stress on the heavenly intercession of Christ, and on the Eucharist as communion, prevents his speaking of an "offering" or even "representation" in the Sacrament except in terms of the celebration of the memory of the Cross, and the proper sacrifice of thanksgiving.

What is objected from the Nicene Council is but weak, that it makes no mention of an unbloody host or victim (hostiae seu victimae $\alpha\upsilon\delta\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota$) - which we deny not if you refer it to a memorial or thanksgiving. But to them it is not unbloody, since they boast

-
1. in I Cor. 9.13.
 2. in Rom. 11.9.

that they have true or, as they say, real blood in the sacrament.
(in I Cor. 5.7)

He limits the Patristic use of offerre as follows:

We contend in the holy mysteries for a giving of thanks, a commemoration and memory of the body and blood of the Lord delivered for us, to be made and to be what the Fathers called to offer ... But in the Church are ministers or as (Ambrose) says, priests of His imago, in whom or through whom Christ Himself or in image, is said to be offered, when the memorial of His death is celebrated in the congregation. (1)

Although Peter Martyr is zealous to guarantee the proper use of sacrificia, he does not relate his doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice to the intercession of Christ in the profound way that Augustine and Calvin do, as a true offering of

-
1. Def. 15, 10-11. The latter context is Ambrose' distinction of umbra, imago and veritas. It is the heavenly Christ, Who has the truth in Himself (rerum veritas est in coelis: quam si velimus intueri eo ascendamus oportet) that gives "the ministry of His image" to the Church. Martyr concludes that the Fathers mean by offering the body and blood of Christ on earth nothing other than "to celebrate the memory among us in the Church, and to give thanks to God for that true and perfect sacrifice once offered of old on the Cross".

Him by prayer and memory, ⁽¹⁾ although this might well be deduced from his treatment of this intercession and the prayers of the Church in the passages from Romans 8 cited above. But in general, his doctrine extends primarily to the giving of thanks in the Sacrament, so that his use of "eucharistic" follows its proper O.T. sense, and not explicitly a sense that in the Eucharist there is a positive relation to the Death of Christ by which we "plead His merits".

The substance of our sacrifice is, a giving of thanks for the body of Christ given on the Cross. And because of this thanksgiving, faith and confession, the Fathers said that the body of Christ is offered in the Supper. (Disp. IV, Q 2)

1. cf. Augustine's De Civ. Dei X. 6 and 20: in Christ the High Priest, the Church shares a corporate sacrifice -- 'This form He offered, and herein was He offered; in this is He our priest, our mediator, and our sacrifice ... By this is He the Priest, offering and offerer. The true sacrament whereof is the Church's daily sacrifice: which, being the body of Him the Head, learns to offer itself by Him.' (Everyman Ed.); Martyr quotes his words on the Psalms, Memoria et cogitatione Christum quotidie immolari (in I Cor. 5.7). Calvin has a striking passage on Numbers 19.2f (Harm. of the Pent. II p 37ff, Cal. Trans. Soc.): "that we may be partakers of ablution, it is necessary that each of us should offer Christ to the Father. For, although He only, and that but once, has offered Himself, still a daily offering of Him, which is effected by faith and prayers, is enjoined to us, not such as the Papists have invented, by whom in their impiety and perverseness the Lord's Supper has been mistakenly turned into a sacrifice, because they imagined that Christ must be daily slain, in order that His death might profit us. The offering, however, of faith and prayers, of which I speak, is very different, and by it alone we apply to ourselves the virtue and fruit of Christ's death ... Thus the people offered vicariously by the hand of the priest; and in this way also at present, although we set Christ before God's face in order to propitiate Him, still it is necessary that Christ Himself should interpose, and exercise the office of a priest". The problem of the relationship of sacramental recordatio or ἀνάμνησις to Christ's heavenly intercession thus touched upon by Augustine and Calvin, is virtually untouched by Martyr, although the elements of his doctrine are essentially of the Augustinian-Calvinist type. Probably his failure to extend the implication of these elements in this way is due to his reaction to Romanist terminology, causing him to limit "sacrifice" to the strictly eucharistic (in its proper sense), just as he limited "substance" to the presence of the Body of Christ in heaven.

Therefore when he states,

Although the Lord's Supper is not a sacrifice, yet it cannot be done without a sacrifice (Prop. ex Lev. 2, nec. 6)

he means by the latter two things: first, the celebration of the memory of the Sacrifice of Christ, which may be figuratively (by the metonymy operative in the sacramental relationship) called an offering of that Sacrifice; and second, the only true and proper sacrifice of the Church of Christ, the offering of the eucharistia or sacrifices of thanksgiving.

3. The Eucharistic Sacrifice Offered.

In the Eucharist we admit no other sacrifice than the sacrifices of thanksgiving (sacrificium eucharistiae), of prayers, and of the offering of our own lives: and these sacrifices must be offered not only by the minister, but also by the people that communicate.
(Epit., Sent. 20)

Peter Martyr's distinction of the O.T. sacrifices according to the twofold oblation means that

Although Christ by one oblation consummated our salvation, there are still remaining to us many and various sacrifices in the New Testament. (Prop. ex Lev. 1, nec. 12)

The paraphernalia of the Mass, however, betray a false understanding of the nature of these sacrifices, of what God requires of His people. The true "ornaments and works" of the Christian Church should be:

First, praises of God, second, confession of sins, ministration of holy doctrine, prayers, receiving the Sacraments, the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, and offerings for the poor. (in I Cor. 3.16)

This concept of the Church's activity as properly sacrificial, and therefore as the offering which the Body of Christ makes to the Father through the sustaining Spirit of its Head, forms the general background for the doctrine of sacrifice

in the Eucharist. Martyr often calls this whole sacrificial life of the Church "eucharistic" since all are expressions of the gratitude of faith - and therefore the Eucharist embodies these in its fourfold oblation, as we shall see below. In one sense, the chief element of the sacrificial response of faith is the offering of self and conversion of fellowmen:

(Paul) wishes us to make ourselves oblations unto God ... And doubtless there is no sacrifice more noble ... all Christians are now sacrificers, who ought to sacrifice not only themselves, but also others, which they especially effect who preach, teach, exhort and admonish their neighbours to return to Christ ... God is so desirous of our salvation that He counts the conversion of every one of us a most acceptable sacrifice. (in Rom. 12.1, 15.16)

This doctrine of the "human sacrifice" of the Church⁽¹⁾ is especially telling in relation to transubstantiation and the priestly office in the Church. The Romanist priest thinks that he is called chiefly "to manufacture the Eucharist".⁽²⁾ But the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches a priesthood which consists rather in offering tribute and sacrifice for sins unto God, which Christ alone did. That oblation being past, the Ministry is called to preach the Gospel, since "Sacraments without doctrine are useless and frigid",⁽³⁾ and since their true sacrifice is the offering up of men, if they succeed to the Apostolic office which Paul describes:

Doubtless is this kind of sacrifice committed unto me by the preaching of the Gospel, to offer up the Gentiles a most acceptable sacrifice unto God. My sword, says Paul (as Chrysostom writes) is the Gospel: the sacrifice killed with my right hand, the Gentiles. Let our consecrators of pieces of bread boast that they are priests because by their enchantment they transubstantiate bread and wine.

-
1. Romans 12.1 is Martyr's favourite text in this regard; but cf. the section in II Reg. 3.27: not only the offering of self, but of others and of our children, is the true oblation, "And these now suffice in respect of human sacrifice".
 2. nisi qui conficere possit Eucharistiam - Def. 207.
 3. Def. 209.

This is that sacrifice, this I say is that priesthood, which the Apostles exercised, and which also the pastors of the Church should now exercise ... here we offer a human sacrifice by the precept of God: but in that fiendish juggling of Popery the souls of simple men are most cruelly murdered ... by our sacrifice we spread abroad the worship of God: but there under a form of piety the most horrible idolatry is retained in the Church. (in Rom. 15.16)

The Romanist priest thinks that he has "no other office than to change the substance of bread", while the common people "think that Christ is taken from them" if the doctrine of transubstantiation is denied. (1)

I would to God the Romish priests would also consider this, and not count all their honour to consist in their transubstantiating the nature of bread (which is but legerdemain and a vain device) but that they would finally understand themselves to be called by God to this, that by Word and doctrine as by good manners and examples, they should transubstantiate men into Christ and make them His lively members. (Serm. ex Hagg. 1)

The minister of Christ has a true sacrifice to offer, indeed a more important sacrifice than had the O.T. priest:

What more excellent and honourable thing can they have, than to be the ambassadors of Christ, and to reconcile the world unto God by their preaching? (in I Cor. 5.7)

At the heart of Martyr's doctrine of Christian sacrifice stands this concern for a living sacrifice, a spiritual offering which begins when "we crucify our own flesh". (2) The Christian carries in his own body a living monument or altar of the heart, on which is engraved 'Christ is my Peace'. (3) But the Lord's Supper is the Church ordinance in which Christian sacrifice finds its special basis and greatest expression: here all sacrifice meets in the particular Thanksgiving.

When the Lord's Supper is celebrated, inasmuch as the body and blood of Christ are by faith and the Spirit given us to be received, and the

-
1. Disp., prefatory speech.
 2. in Rom. 1.19.
 3. in Iud. 6.24.

promise of that conjunction which we have with Christ sealed, so that we are members of His body, in this respect I say it is and is called a Sacrament, since in that action God gives His gifts to us. But inasmuch as by the same action we celebrate the memory of the death of Christ, give thanks for the benefits received, consecrate and offer ourselves to God, it is and may be called a proper Sacrifice, since we give most acceptable oblations unto God.
(in Iud. 2.5)

The Eucharist itself involves a fourfold offering: ⁽¹⁾ almsgiving (including the offering of bread and wine), thanksgiving, the offering of self, and lastly the memorial of Christ's death sacramentally called a sacrifice. Martyr illustrates these from the early Church practice and doctrine.

But since Christ is said to be immolated, what do these sacrificers mean that say He is sacrificed every day in the Mass? Concerning these things, it is to be noted that in the Lord's Supper there may be four oblations. The first is of the bread and wine brought in by the people. From a certain part of this the Eucharist was celebrated; from this source the faithful communicated among themselves; and what remained was distributed to the poor.

Under this first head, Martyr cites Irenaeus and Tertullian, and also Philip-
ians 4.18, in which Paul

shows that alms are sacrifices, when he writes that he received those things which they sent him as a sweet smelling sacrifice unto God.

The question of how bread and wine are offered to God is answered in this context of their relationship to almsgiving. ⁽²⁾

-
1. This teaching is found in I Cor. 5.7.
 2. cf. Def. 75, where Gardiner states that Melchizedec offered "the true body and blood of Christ under those species", to which Martyr points out that historically, he offered the food and drink to Abraham, not God, and theologically, we are not priests after his order, but Christ is, the High Priest in heaven; also Def. 73: what is the nova oblatio of the Church in the Supper? Martyr asks. Two things: first, bread and wine, since part is offered by the people to the holy assembly, and part to the poor; second, the people's prayers, thanksgiving, et omnia illa quae communicando ad cultum dei facimus. This oblation is "new" because we are freed from the rites and places of the O.T. dispensation, and because we give thanks for what is done and therefore present, while those foreshadowed something future.

Moreover we deny not that the bread in the Lord's Supper is in a sense offered unto God to be sanctified, and that it is made a sacrament by Him. The difficulty and question under debate is whether Christ Himself is offered unto God the Father by those who sacrifice.

He now turns to the three other kinds of sacrifice in the Eucharist.

In the next place is the giving of thanks (gratiarum actio), which in the holy Scripture is called the sacrifice of praise (immolatio laudis). Thirdly, the communicants offer themselves unto God to be ruled and mortified ... Fourth and last, when it is spoken there of the memorial of the death of Christ, which was the true sacrifice, by a figurative speech the Eucharist or Lord's Supper takes its name from the thing it represents and is called a sacrifice, as Augustine says upon the Psalms, 'By memory and meditation Christ is offered daily'.

The Eucharist therefore involves the whole of Christian sacrifice, and serves both as a true oblation offered unto the Father and as a means of grace to establish believers in their faith, ⁽¹⁾ so that its whole purpose may be summed up as "communion" and "thanksgiving":

But we teach that pious men are provoked by these symbols or visible words, to think upon the things themselves, which are represented by these symbols, and feed on them in spirit and in mind ... the matter itself is gone: only its memory is retained in the mysteries, and for that thanks are given publicly. (Def. 793, 676)

The Eucharistic sacrifice is thus for Martyr the essence of Christian life and action. He regards it as the summary and highest expression of the Church's being, since it embodies all that Christ commanded His Church to do in her service of God. ⁽²⁾ This is therefore the normal and normative worship of the People of God. Although Peter Martyr does not state as explicitly as Calvin ⁽³⁾ that the

1. quod dignatus esset usque ad finem illos constantes in fide servare - De Vot. 1531C.
2. An in Comm. lig. 21: "All that Christ commanded may be reduced to four words"; cf. in Iud. 1.33. He follows Augustine's interpretation of the "four words" of I Timothy 2.1, which he relates to the Eucharistic service: δευτέρεις, supplications which precede the celebration of the Sacrament; ἡποσενυχτί, prayers in the administration of the Sacrament (we vow ourselves unto Christ), ἐντενέσεις, petitions by which the minister prays for all present, and ἐὐχαριστία, general thanksgivings.
3. Articles of Nov., 1536.

Eucharist should be celebrated "at least every Sunday", this is his constant pre-supposition. Thus describing the worship of the Lord's Day in connection with almsgiving (which he relates internally to the Eucharist) he writes:

And to inflame our minds to give alms Paul very fitly chose the day of the holy congregation, because of the Word of God, the public prayers and holy lessons used on that day, through which we are put in remembrance of the benefits which God has bestowed on us for His mercy's sake. Also we receive the sacraments, by which the memory of that most excellent benefit is renewed, I mean of the death of our Lord Jesus Christ. (in Gen. 2.1)

The question of the frequency of communion is simply the question of the divinely-appointed means by which the Church responds to the love of its Lord: since we "cannot be thankful enough" of His sacrifice, the Sacrament of the Eucharist ought to be "most familiar to the faithful". (1)

And since so great a price is paid for our salvation, we must not suffer so great a benefit to lightly slip from memory. To avoid this, we are helped not only by doctrine and Scripture, but also by sacraments. For just as the frequent sacrifices shadowed the coming Christ among the Elders, so now the frequent use of the mysteries brings to memory His death and blood shed for us. (in Rom. 3.24)

In this respect also, the Patristic age may be our guide, according to Martyr, whose contemporary situation demanded the replacement of daily Masses by frequent Communions:

First, there were not innumerable daily private Masses, as there are today. Once or twice in seven days, not every day, was the Supper held. Next, although strangers passed by, they were unwilling to abstain from holy communion, but it was proper to minister as it suited those that arrived. (De Vot. 1595B)

Ambrose, for instance, exhorted ministers of his day to be ready

1. Catech. 17, in I Cor. 10.15f; cf. in I Cor. 4.2: frequent communion is urged against Romanism, which thinks it "lawful for them to communicate only at Easter".

to distribute the holy mysteries, which, he says, used to be done once a week, unless more often because of strangers. (1)

Finally, the nature of faith itself demands such regular communication, since faith corresponds to the promises of God: regenerate men cooperate with the Holy Spirit and so must come frequently to the holy mystery to express the assent of soul and faith to the promises. (2)

.

Thus Peter Martyr's doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice brings us to the heart of the problem of Christian service and worship. This it answers by interpreting the movement of faith as the grateful response to God's Word of mercy in which we are lifted up in soul and mind to the Heavenly Redeemer Himself, and in which we are enabled to offer unto Him the sacrifice of thanksgiving for His benefits. Communion and thanksgiving are the two chief elements involved in the response of faith, and both find their central meaning and deepest expression in that which is both the Gospel of God made visible and the Sacrifice of the Church made actual, the Sacrament of the Eucharist. Just as Melchizedec, priest of the Most High God, offered to Abraham and his soldiers food for their hungry and weary bodies, so Christ our High Priest offers us nourishment for soul and body by the real presence of His own Death and Life. In our pilgrimage and struggle, our hunger and weariness may discover a fulness

-
1. in Tud. 4.5 - according to Jerome and Augustine, "Christians communicated every day"; cf. in I Cor. 7.5.
 2. in I Cor. 11.25. cf. Def. 325: what broke down this normal worship of the Church was the doctrine of transubstantiation, because "corporeal presence hinders frequency of communion", the Mass making it sufficient for people to "see Christ being made" or "putting on" bread (or accidents!) so that they "never get as far as communion" (communione nunquam accedere).

of satisfaction in His self-communication. And this gracious movement of accomodative love summons from our side a grateful praise and thanksgiving, the eucharistic sacrifice of the Church of Christ. As He becomes our Head through grace so we become His Body through gratitude.

This study in the sacramental theology of Peter Martyr could end on no more worthy note than this of the eucharistic sacrifice as the great offering of the Church unto God. His emphasis upon the mighty saving acts of Jesus Christ in both Old and New Testament; his central teaching of faith as union with Christ; his dynamic penetration of every doctrine by reference to the personal office of the Holy Spirit; his acceptance of this office as implying the sacramental category, the analogy of Christ and of faith in all our knowledge of God and life in Christ - these unite to establish the Church as the very Body of Christ, sharing His life and activity, enjoying His real presence and offering Him its true sacrifice. The prayers of the Church, its good works, its devotional life and theological service - all derive meaning and purpose only as the Church centres about this Table, receives this Food, offers this Sacrifice.

.
Come, at length, we beseech Thee O heavenly Father, and illuminate the hearts and minds of all thy Christians with the Spirit of Jesus Christ Thy Son, that forsaking idols and superstitions they may be converted unto Thee alone, Who ought to be purely and sincerely served ... Thy holy name hath been long enough dishonoured with reproaches, the pureness of Thy Gospel long enough polluted, enough and too much have men abused the institution of Thy Son's Supper in most impure idolatry. Stop at last these furies of men, O Lord ... And Thou Jesus Christ, the true and eternal God, confirm this work which Thou hast begun, and bring it to the desired end: or else, if there be no hope of recovery, if no more in Thy Church shall Thy truth have public and open place, come quickly and hasten Thy judgment, and for the glory of Thy name turn away such shameful abuse from Thy holy Supper, which Thou hast instituted in Thine incredible mercy and excellent goodness: Who, with the Father and the Holy Spirit livest and reignest world without end, Amen.

(Prayer against false worship)

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A : THE WORKS OF PETER MARTYR.

1. Principal Works.

- 1543 - Proposita ad disputandum publice in Schola Argentinensi, ex Gen., Exod., Levit. et Iudic. (published 1582)
- 1544 - Una Semplice Dichiaratione sopra gli XII Articoli ... Basilea, 1544 (later pub. as Catechismus sive Symboli expositio ...)
- 1549 - Disputatio de Euch. Sac. in celeb. Angliae schola Oxon. habita; ad haec Tractatio de Sac. Euch. habita Oxon. cum iam absolvisset interpret. XI Cap. prioris Epist. ad Corinth. - Londini 1549 (Tiguri, 1557, 1562, 1579)
- 1558 - Commentaria in Epist. S. Pauli ad Romanos, 2 tom., - Basil. 1558 (fol. Tiguri 1559; E.T. ('by H.B.') Lond. 1568)
- 1559 - Defensio doctrinae veteris et Apost. de ss. Euch. ... adv. St. Gardin. Tig. 1559
- De Votis Monasticis ... adv. Ricc. Smyth., Basil. 1559.
- Aristotelis Ethicae cum illis in Sacra Script. collatae - Basil. 1559 (Tig. 1582; included in Meditationes Ethicae, of Hyperius): Books I, II and beginning of III only.
- 1561 - Dialogus de Utraque in Christo natura, - 1561.
- Comm. in librum Iudicum, fol. - Tig. 1561 (Argent. 1582; E.T. Lond. 1564)
- Brevis Epitome (sive Analysis) disputationis de Euch. in Gardinerum, -1561.
- 1562 - Comm. in priorem Epist. ad Corinthios, fol. (Tig. 1572)
- 1564 - Comm. in Samuelis Phrop. libros duos, - Tig. 1564 (Tig. 1595)
- Preces Sacrae ex Psalm. David. desumptae - Tig. 1564.
- 1566 - Comm. in duos posteriores libros Regum, fol. - 1566 (Tig. 1581, Heidelb. 1599): only to II Kings 11; Joh. Wolfius completed the work.
- 1572 - Comm. in Gen. - Tig. 1572 (Heidelb. 1606); only to Ch. 42; Iud. Lavater completed the work.
- 1629 - Comm. in Lament. Jer. Proph. - Tig. 1629.

2. Lesser Works.

- De Vitandis Superst. ... excusatio ad Pseudoniconem ... 4to. Genevae. 1549 (French trans. 1582, 'Excuse aux faux Nicodemites'): This work of Calvin's included the opinion of Melancthon, Bucer and Martyr; the purpose was to warn against "too great rigour" during the initial stages of Reformation.
- Clariss. et Magnif. Dominis Schol. Argent., Dec. 27, 1553
- Oratio ad Acad. Argent. ... de studio Theologico, 1553.
- Confessio seu Sent. de Coena Dom. ... Argent., 1556.
- Oratio quam Tig. prima habuit ... 1556.
- Sent. de praesentia Corporis Christi in Euch. ... in Coll. Poiss. habito, 1561; 'Brève instruction de M. Pierre Martyr de la Sainte Cène'... Poissy, 1561.
- An Missa Sit Sacrificium
- Oratio de utilitate et dignitate sacri Ministerii; Exhortatio iuventutis ad sac. lit. studium (on Malachi 2; given at Oxford)
- De Morte Christi (sermon on Phil. 2)
- De Resurrectione Christi (sermon)
- Sermo in Locum Ioan. XX Cap. (on John 20. 19-23)
- Sermo ex Hagg. I (given at Oxford)

- Encomium Verbi Dei in Scripturis Traditi, et ad harum studium adhortatio.
- Adhortatio ad Coenam Domini Mysticam (the second exhortation of the Book of Common Prayer, from the Sunday before the Sacrament is to be celebrated)

(Collected works);

- Epistolae partim Theologicae, partim familiares
- Epistolarum *by 80x5*
- Loci Communes Pet. Mart., quatuor classes, R. Massonius, Ed. - Londini, 1576, 1583 (Tig. 1587; Genev. 1623; Heidelb. 1603; Amst. et Franc. 1656; E.T. by A. Marten, Lond. 1579)
- Locorum Comm., Tom. tert., Grynaeus, Ed. - Basil. 1580 (I: L.C.; II: Dial., Def., Disp.; III: Preces. Epist. etc)

The Editions used in this work are as follows: Def.: 1559; Tract. and Disp.: 1557; Dial. and De. Vot.: Basil., 1581; Commentaries are cited according to Chapter and verse; Treatises according to the sections of the L.C. of Lond. 1583, as below.

Treatises in the Commentaries: De Iustificatione, in Rom. 11 at end (L.C. III.4) De Poenitentia, in II Sam. at end (L.C. III.8); De Resurrectione, (in II Reg. 4.37 (L.C. III.15); An in Communione liceat una spec., in I Cor. 10.17 (L.C. IV. 11); De Templorum Dedic., in I Reg. 8.66 (L.C. IV. 9)

- There is also a Treatise in Italian, which I have not seen, Trattato Della Vera Chiesa Cattolica e Della Necessita di Vivere in Essa, first pub. Geneva, 1573 and later included in the Biblioteca della Riforma Italiana (Vol. IV; Tipografia Claudiana). I owe this reference to the Rev. M. di Gangi of Hamilton, Canada.

3. Problematic Works.

M. Young (*op.cit.* pp 584ff) includes in his Bibliography a reference to Comment. in priores libros, which should be continued in the next item, Ethicarum Aristotelis. He misread these as two separate works, from A. Teissier's list (Eloges des hommes savans, I. 217). However, his reference to Comment. in Exodus; Comment. in Prophetas aliquot minores introduces an important problem: were Martyr's lectures upon Genesis, Exodus, part of Leviticus, and the Minor Prophets (given at Strassburg, 1553-1556) ever published? Simler (Oratio) had stated that the Commentaries on Samuel and Kings were to be published, "and perhaps" those on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, the Prophets, Lamentations, and the Ethics of Aristotle. Of these, only the first and last two were published. Schmidt (II. 294) examines the question of the others: Simler and Lavater "undertook the editing of the Lectures on the O.T." and found notes on Gen. 1-42, Exod. 1-34, Samuel, Kings, Lament. and the Minor Prophets. They wrote to Conrad Hubert in England about Martyr's other works, but he had "only a copied note-book on the third Book of Moses". From his study of the correspondence, Schmidt concludes that Martyr's notes "on the second and third Books of Moses, and the fragment on the Minor Prophets, appear to have remained

unprinted". A further interesting comment in this same passage is Simler's note about a reference in this correspondence to a work of Martyr's on I John, which seems to be an error based on a confusion of the data available to Simler. In hopes that the notes on Leviticus might be extant, I made enquiries which resulted in the following: Martyr took all his notes with him on leaving Strassburg and the Simler Collection at Zürich contains any remaining material; but enquiries about the document in question proved fruitless. It would seem that Hubert's own notebook was the only source available to Simler, who decided against publishing that or the notes on Exodus 1 - 34 he had in his possession. Martyr's own words on the subject are perhaps of interest: he wrote to Bullinger from Oxford on Oct. 2, 1551, at which time he was preparing his Commentary on Romans for publication: "As to those other commentaries of mine which you inquire after, I do not see how they can possibly be published in so short a time: for what I have written upon Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and the minor prophets, are brief and hasty annotations; so that there needs leisure for revising, and copying over again, what I at first wrote out for my own sole use, and for that of others. But if it please God to spare my life, and I should obtain a little leisure, I shall not object to publish them; not that I consider any work of mine as of any value, but that I may not seem arrogantly to disregard the wishes of my friends". (Orig. Lett. II, p 499)

2. In the Loc. Comm., Massonius included three works of Bullinger's, De Libero Arbitrio, De Providentia et Praedestinatione, and An Deus Sit Causa et Author Peccati: L.C. 971, 992, 994. These were composed by Bullinger in 1553, and being found among Martyr's papers without signature or name, were carelessly taken for Martyr's work - Schmidt (I. 102n). For Martyr's own teaching see his Comm. in I Cor., f 26B, De Libero Arbitrio; in Rom. 9, De Praedestinatione; and in I Sam. f 19A, An Deus Sit Author Peccati.

3. There is extant a little volume printed in 1555, consisting of a Sermon by Henry Bullinger, and a Treatise ascribed to him: 'A Treatise of the cohabitation of the faithful with the unfaithful ... A Sermon of the true confessing of Christ ... made in the convocation of the clergy at Zürich the 28th day of January, 1555 by H.B.' There has been some doubt as to whether it was Bullinger or Martyr who wrote the Treatise. Now this is actually a Treatise written by Peter Martyr and found in his Commentaries on the Book of Judges (in Iud. 1.36, ff 27B - 35B Tig. 1582) entitled An Christianis Liceat Cum Infidelibus Habitare. A careful comparison revealed that it was an English translation of this section of the Commentary, which dealt with the difference between the Mass and the Lord's Supper. Since the Commentary was not published until 1561, Martyr must have written the Treatise earlier, no doubt during his residence in England, when his and Bullinger's teaching had such influence, and allowed it to be published in this form. The Treatise and Sermon were later published along with 'The chief grounds of Christian Religion, set down by way of Catechizing ... By Ezekiel Rogers ... London, 1642'.

4. A quaint, short work entitled Narratio historica viciss. rerum quae in inclyto Brit. regno acciderunt A.D. 1553 mense Julio. Scripta a P.V. Antwerp, 1553 sets forth the hypothesis that King Edward VI's death was "caused or accelerated by unfair means" and "boldly ascribes the king's death to the agency of the duke (of Northumberland, the king's guardian) by violent means, poison, or the dagger".

The quotation is from the E.T. (London, 1865) of J. Ph. Berjeau, whose researches were thought to prove that Peter Martyr (P. Vermigli) was the author. This has since been disproved, and authorship remains uncertain (although Peter Viret was in England about that time) - the copies in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the University Library, Cambridge however, still erroneously ascribe this work to Peter Martyr.

Manuscripts.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge: MS 102. 5-8, 29-31 (Cat. by James), Letters to Bucer de causa et argumentis Mag. Yungi; de Statu Germaniae; consolatoria de morbis; a sermon and cogitations concerning the Devon. revolt; Epist. ad quendam episcopum ubi multis argumentis contra August. probat, quod post justum divoritum utrisque licet altero superstite matrimonium denuo contrahere. MS 119. 37-40, 44, Letters to Bucer de fide Christi generale et de concordia de re sacramentaria; ut non det se in disputationem nisi adsint iudices idonei; de libro precum communium; de Smitheo et libellis eius, and de adversa eius valetudine. MS 340. 4-6, Sermons in seditionem, and Dialogus regis et populi Italice.

University Library (Anderson Room), Cambridge: Tracts Mm 4.14, brief Treatise on the Vestment controversy. Baumgartner Paper (Strype Corr.) Add 3 (c), copy of the Censura Libri Comm. Prec. (Corp. Christi 119.39). Baker MSS, vol. 31, Mm 1.42, copy of the Letter of consolation to Bucer (Corp. Christi 102.8).

Bodleian Library, Oxford: MS New College (Ncy. cccxliii.12), two letters to Bucer of Oct. 25, 1550, concerning the Vestment controversy; MS Queen's College (Reg. cclxxxiv.181), Letter to Edward VI.

APPENDIX B : SECONDARY SOURCES.

- Simler, Josias, Oratio de Vita et Obitu Clarissimi Viri et Praestantiss. Theologi D. Pet. Mart. Verm ... 1562 - printed in Gerdes, Scriin. Antiqu. III.ii, and in all the Loc. Comm.
- Beza, Theo., Icones, Genev. 1580; slightly longer account in Les Vraies Pourtraits, 1581.
- Schlosser, F.C., Leben des Theo. de Beze und des Peter Martyr, Heidelberg, 1809.
- Young, M., The Life and Times of Aonio Paleario, London, 1860, Chapter X, 'Peter Martyr Vermiglio'.
- Schmidt, C., Vie de Pierre Martyr Vermigli, Strassburg, 1835.
- Peter Martyr Vermigli, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften, Elberfeld, 1858 (Vol. VII of Leben und aus ... der reformierten Kirche, Hagenbach, Ed.)

The above are the main biographical works; Schmidt's 1858 work is the only one of a seriously critical nature. Simler is the basis of the rest, but Young has included much material from the Italian scene, while Schmidt has examined sources of the Strassburg and Zürich periods thoroughly; Schlosser's constant comparison of Martyr with Beza often distorts the history, and he is not so careful a scholar as Schmidt. In 1860 Young wrote (op.cit. p 492), "The life of Peter Martyr is worthy of a more extended history than the limits of a chapter can afford, and is still a desideratum in sacred literature. The materials are abundant, and would well repay a scholar's diligence if taken up as a separate work, incorporating his correspondence with the chief men of the day". The desideratum still exists, and the materials are even more abundant. Below we shall give the chief, with works of adversaries first.

- White, John, Bp. of Winchester, Diacosio-martyrion ... de veritate corporis et sanguinis Christi in Euch. ... adv. P. Martyrem, London 1553.
- Chorus alternatim conetium ('A satire in verse on the controversy between G. Haddon and J. Osorio da Fonseca, Bishop of Silves, attached to a caricature in which Haddon, Bucer and Peter Martyr are represented as dogs drawing a car on which Osorio is seated in triumph'), 1563?
- Laing, Jas., De Vita et Moribus atque rebus gestis haereticorum nostri temporis ... Paris, 1581.
- Schulting, Cornelius, Bibliotheca catholica et orthodoxa, contra summam totius theologiae Calviniae in Institutionibus J. Calvini et Locis Communibus Petri Martyris, breviter comprehensae, Col. Agrip. 1602. (This "brief" work contains 5 vols. in 2, mainly directed against Calvin's work).
- Parker Society literature: Original Letters, 2 vols. Camb. 1847; Zurich Letters; Camb. 1842.
- Strype, John, Ecclesiastical Memorials, vols. II, III, London, 1816.
- Memorials of Cramer, London, 1694.
- Burnet, G., History of the Reformation of the Church of England, London 1681. (Part. III has appendices of Letters to Martyr of Jewel, etc. and one of Martyr to Bullinger on the state of the U. of Oxford, June 1, 1550: App. 6)

The materials in the 19th C. Gorham controversy include 'Gleanings' and 'Extracts' (G.C. Gorham, 1849-1850) of passages from Martyr and Bullinger, in relation to the doctrine of infant Baptism in the Book of Common Prayer. Also Wm. Goode's editing of a Letter of Martyr to Bullinger of June 14, 1552 on this subject, 'An Unpublished Letter etc. London, 1850'.

Young, (op.cit. p 585) mentions "a useful little book by the Rev. E. Bridge, vicar of Manaccan, Cornwall. A Voice from the Tomb of P. Martyr against Popery. 1840," which I have been unable to locate.

APPENDIX C : PETER MARTYR'S PATRISTIC SOURCES.

Peter Martyr's theology is Patristic in a profound sense: extensively, a work such as the *Defensio* is actually a commentary upon the writings of the Fathers; intensively, his Patristic sources have authority because of their relation to holy Scripture. Martyr's first and formative principle is that theology has as its subject-matter the Scriptural and not the Patristic text: Deus dixit is the sole norm of theological activity (in I Cor., Praef.). He warns explicitly against converting theology into patrology:

We are called Theologians, and such we would be accounted: let us answer to the name and profession - unless instead of theologi we would be patrologi! (Exhort. Iuv.)

An example of this process is offered by "Smyth the brawler of Oxford" who armed himself with the Fathers without correcting them by Scripture (Def. 68). It is the activity of such men that draws from Martyr the detailed interpretation of the Fathers that characterizes his polemical writings.

Because we have certain adversaries who depend very little or not at all upon Scripture, but measure all their religion by the Fathers and Councils, so that they might rather be called Patrologi than Theologi, and - even more intolerable - collect little sentences out of the writings of the Fathers, and obtrude them to the people, to obscure truth more easily ... (therefore) we also will allege out of the Fathers. (De Iustif. 36)

This gathering of sententiae from the Patristic writings is characteristic of the Romanist doctores tabularii "who have more skill in indices than in books" (De Iustif. 24), listing every mention of words like sacrificium and praeparatio as if these support their theories of propitiatory Mass and preparatory grace. Against this custom Martyr brings two principles for interpreting the Fathers. First is the Deus dixit which alone makes for sound doctrine:

First we should define doctrines soundly out of Scripture itself. Then afterwards may the Fathers be read with judgment. (in Rom. 4.7)

We must read them warily and with discrimination, correcting them by Scripture, and not vice versa as the Romanist declares. To the latter's claim that Scripture is obscure and the Fathers a surer source, Martyr says:

yet who see not meanwhile, or pretend they do not see, what Labyrinths are in the Fathers ... when there are obscure places in the Fathers, what shall I do, where shall I fly? Other Fathers succeed, who may interpret the former - and when obscurity and difficulty occur again in them, later interpreters are further appointed, so that the thing will never end! (Exhort. Iuv.)

Thus Augustine uses Basil, Chrysostom, and so on; others use Augustine - and when there could be neither end nor measure "Peter Lombard came, to make all hard places plain"! And even Lombard had infinite interpreters, chiefly Scotus and Occam. Then Thomas was expounded by Cajetan and Capreolus, Scotus by Zorobellus and Leschetus, Occam by Gabriel Biel and Gregory Ariminensis. Martyr concludes the passage -

Let us return, I beseech you, let us return to the first fountains of the Scriptures.

Along with this principle Martyr places another, that there are "degrees of the Fathers" (Disp. III, vs Morg.). Thus Theophylact, for instance, lived in the time

of great dissension between the Greek and Latin Churches concerning the Holy Spirit, and must be read accordingly - and this was the time when "the doctrine of transubstantiation began to sprout". In contrast, Martyr adds, Augustine "lived in purer times". This becomes a general principle of interpretation: he distinguishes "the Fathers that were of greater antiquity and the purer age" from "the latter writers of the Church" (De Templ. Ded. 21), for in the main, "Later Fathers speak less prudently" (Def. 97). This requires certain qualification, inasmuch as even in Augustine's time the Sacraments had too much attributed to them, but in general Augustine "weighs these things more diligently and closely" than other Fathers (in Iud. 19.14). This second principle introduces the question of particular Patristic sources for his theology.

Peter Martyr's remarkable knowledge of the Fathers is evident throughout his whole life, and soon became known among his contemporaries as worthy of their notice. In Naples he had opposed the doctrine of purgatory on Scriptural authority, supported by testimonies of the Fathers; in Strassburg his lectures were noted for their regular inclusion of Patristic exegesis of the Biblical text; in England his lectures on I Corinthians and his Disputation at Oxford opposed the doctrine of transubstantiation on the basis of Patristic analogical thinking. An interesting account of one document indicates Martyr's place as a Patristic scholar - Chrysostom's Ad Caesarium Monachum, fragments of which are preserved in Greek by Jo. Damascene, Anastasius and Nicephorus. A Latin version for the remainder was brought to England by Martyr, and presented to Crammer, who used it in his 'Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament, etc.' of 1550 (see 1907 ed., note by H. Jenkyns on p 52, Book II, Ch. 5). Gardiner disputed its genuineness (doubtless because of its expressions against transubstantiation) and it has remained a subject of controversy. Crammer's copy disappeared after his death, and since Martyr "had not stated from whence it was procured, Cardinal Perron ventured to charge him with having forged it". But in 1680 the original MS was discovered in the library of the Dominican monastery of St. Mark at Florence, and finally published in 1685 by Le Moyne, whose defence of its genuineness induced scholars such as Bigot and Dupin to accept it. This "discovery" would have been made much sooner, and in circumstances less striking, if Martyr's adversaries had troubled to read his Tractatio more carefully. For there he clearly states the location of the document under discussion: "Chrysostom to Caesar the Monk, in the time of his second exile, against Appollinarus and others who confounded the divinity and humanity of Christ (this Epistle is kept in the library at Florence, although it is not imprinted)..." (habetur in bibliotheca Florentina haec Epistola, licet non sit impressa) - Tract. 31.

When Martyr and Ochino went to England, one of the purchases which the former made in preparation for the journey is listed as "Pd. for the works of S. Augustine, Cyprian and Epithanius for Petrus Marter at Basell ..." (Expences of the Journey ... by John Abell, 1547). Apart from this incidental reference, we do not know the extent of his library. But in his writings we see clearly that Augustine was his chief Patristic source - in the Defensio, for example, there are approximately sixty-four places of Augustine quoted over one hundred times, as against thirty-four from Chrysostom, twenty from Ambrose, and so on in descending order of use. Such quantitative incidence merely reflects the profound reliance of Martyr upon Augustine's works, and in particular certain passages which are foundational for his sacramental teaching, which we have noted throughout our work -

the sacrament as verbum visibilis, the necessity of abiding in Christ to eat His body, etc.

Finally, the problem of Martyr's use of Theodoret deserves mention. In his 'Treatise', 'Disputations' and 'Defence' Martyr makes extensive use of Gelasius and Theodoret - both of whom are rejected by his opponents as "Nestorians"! The reaction to his quoting Theodoret in the Disputation is interesting. Tresham's first objection to Theodoret is that he "was a Nestorian heretic, as appears plainly enough from the history of Nicephorus, and the Council of Chalcedon". To this Martyr replies by rehearsing the events of the Synods of Ephesus and Chalcedon; the former (the Robber-Synod of 449) had condemned him along with Nestorius, the friend of his youth, although he had already refuted his earlier support of the Nestorian hypothesis, and the latter accepted him as a leading theologian, since he had been reinstated by Pope Leo. (cf. O. Bardenhever, Patrology, The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church, E.T. by Shahan, 1908, sect. 78, 'Theodoret of Cyrus'). Tresham then brings another objection: "He is but an obscure author, and no man has him but you: wherefore he must not be cited for the defining of so great a matter". Martyr answers, "The book is printed, and may be bought at Rome". Tresham then concludes most appropriately, "I answer that it would be a long and tedious thing to go to Rome for such a book". Besides reminding us of Martyr's singular acquaintance with Patristic documents, this passage raises the question of what this book was which Martyr had bought at Rome. Was it perhaps the lost work of Theodoret, his Pentalogium against Cyril and the Council of Ephesus, which has perished except for a few fragments? (cf. Migne, Pat. Gr. 84, 65-88). An examination of all the passages in which Martyr uses Theodoret against the doctrine of transubstantiation lead us to reply in the negative: at least, if this was what he possessed, he did not use it. His quotations are all from Theodoret's first two Dialogues against Eutychianism or Monophysitism, entitled ἐπεὶ τῶν ἑκείνου πολυμορφίας, ('The Beggar and the Polymorph' - cf. Migne, 83, 27-336). The first concerns the ἁγία πύλη of the divinity of Christ and the second concerns the ἁγία φύσις of the divinity and humanity. Martyr uses their analogia Christi as a principal argument against the doctrine of transubstantiation. We must therefore conclude that we have no evidence to prove conclusively that a full "Theodoret" was available to Peter Martyr.

A final aspect of this brief comment upon Peter Martyr's Patristic sources is the problem of his relationship with Crammer. Strype (Mem. of Cran. II, Ch. XXV) presents the hypothesis that Martyr came to England as "a Papist, or a Lutheran, as to the belief of the Presence" in the Eucharist. It was Crammer's influence which brought Martyr to the true doctrine, which he subsequently set forth in his Treatise, and upheld in the Disputation. Our historical and theological study proves conclusively, however, that this hypothesis is untenable; the 1544 Catechism alone proves that Martyr left Italy with a consistently Reformed doctrine of the sacraments, and already stated therein his hopes concerning "a full treatise of the sacraments, which nevertheless I hope shortly to bring to pass, if the Lord lend me life" (Catech. 42). The charge of suiting doctrine to governmental desires was levelled at both Bucer and Martyr (cf. Strype, Ecc. Mem. II, pp 196ff), and indeed pursued Martyr all his life, caught as he was between Lutheran and "Zwinglian" sides of the Reformation - in 1555 he wrote to Bullinger about

charges of inconsistency, "I have ever taken the greatest possible care not to blow hot and cold out of my mouth" (Orig. Lett. II p 517). Now Strype's claim is that Cranmer's Patristic theology was the deciding factor in Martyr's theological development. His evidence, at least for Cranmer's Patristic knowledge, is significant: there is still extant in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Cranmer's own note-book entitled in his own hand De Re Sacramentaria, and comprising a remarkable collection of Patristic quotations about the Eucharist. His conclusions from this study are identical with Martyr's doctrine, as are his arguments against "the crass Papists, or Capernaïtes", first of which is Quod Accidentia mancant sine subiecto. Martyr himself stated in his Preface to the Tract., dedicated to Cranmer, "Nor is there any book old or new in which I have not seen with these eyes notes in your own hand, whatever pertained to this whole controversy". But the facts of the Patristic studies pursued by Bucer and Martyr at Strassburg prior to 1547, plus Martyr's authority as a Patristic scholar when he came to England suggest that he had as much to offer Cranmer as he received, and in the case of such Continental documents as those of Chrysostom and Theodoret mentioned above, much more.

APPENDIX D : BUCER, CALVIN, AND MARTYR.

The question of Peter Martyr's relationship to his contemporaries has concerned us at certain points throughout our historical and theological study, and now merits closer attention in terms of its own. The key would seem to lie with the Strassburg Reformer, Martin Bucer. It was in Strassburg that both Calvin and Martyr dwelt on the closest terms with Bucer, during the critical period of their lives; and the theological coincidence among the three men is more than accidental. In the dilemma of the Reformation, which so quickly separated into two rival camps, symbolized by Luther and Zwingli, a new and distinctive note was sounded, first by Bucer, and most distinctively and permanently by Calvin, but equally as much by Martyr. Despite their individual differences, they consciously worked for the same ends - truly ecumenical ends, it should be noted - and these are most clearly revealed in the doctrine of the Sacrament.

Bucer and Calvin.

By way of introduction to this complex problem, we may take the reaction of Bucer (and Capito) to Calvin's Confessio Fidei de Eucharistia of 1537 (Presented to the Synod of Bern: text in Calv. Epist. et Resp. 348). Calvin's typical stress upon the dynamic virtue flowing from Christ, the office of the Holy Spirit, the totus Christus, and the use of the terms substantia and exhibere - all this is accepted by Bucer's subscription as "orthodox", complying especially in the localizing of Christ's continuing humanity, the ascending motion of faith, and the rejection of the view that reduces the symbols to nuda et inania and ignores the reception of ipsum Dominum verum Deum et hominem. Along with this early document we should place Bucer's important letter to Calvin in criticism of the Consensus Tigurinus of 1549 (dated Aug. 14, 1549, Lambeth and London: text in Corpus Reform. XLI - Ioan. Calv. Op., Vol. XIII, pp 350ff). Bucer begins with a general agreement (Magnas vero gratias ago Domino ...) and then notes three points of criticism. First he would stress the true communion with Christ more than the formula does. This stress, he states, does not imperil the truth of Christ's heavenly glory and human nature if we define it as "not of this world, not of sense, not of reason": we must say together et gloriam coelestem, et simul eius inter nos praesentiam, inhabitationem in nobis, manducationem. He is horrified by the tendency to avoid Christ's words of consolation as to the real communion by which we are united as bone of His bone. He stands against those that preach "Christ rather absent than present in His mysteries", labouring "rather to explain what the minister might not effect, than what Christ confers through it, rightly administered and received by faith". For thus the Spirit increases our communion with Christ: this should be stated explicitly, he concludes. Second, he agrees with what is said about the truth of Christ's humanity - but "Let them not make a new article of faith concerning the certain place of heaven in which the body of Christ is contained"! He would define the mode of Christ's presence merely negatively - "not of this world" - and demand only that the doctrine of the Ascension be firmly held. Scripture does not press us to enquire further about the heavenly place. Third, as against their damning the Lutheran words by which

they understand Christ to be enclosed or affixed locally in the symbols, Bucer objects that "I have dealt again and again with so many Lutherans" and only discovered them to wish "Christ to be truly given and received in the Supper" without determining about Christ's descent or ascent, or implying that sense or reason perceive anything apart from faith. Bucer concludes with Mihi vos satisfacistis ... Now these points are the identical ones upon which Bucer criticizes Martyr, and revolve about the question whether the manner of Christ's presence in terms of His humanity is to be indicated negatively or positively. Bucer's negative delineation allowed him to accept the Lutheran terminology, and on this point we may feel that he thereby succeeded in accepting that other aspect of the truth of the Mystery of Christ (of the *ἀνυπόστασία*) that we noted in Chapter 9 above. Yet we must also point out that Calvin's absolute rejection of the Lutheran manducatio impiorum was based upon something deeper than a misunderstanding.

Bucer and Martyr.

The key document in this section is the correspondence of the two men concerning Martyr's Disputation of 1549 (text in full in Mart. Buc. Scripta Anglicana ... Basil. 1577, pp 545ff). Bucer had attended the Disputations, and probably voiced some disapproval of Martyr's terminology at least. Martyr wrote to him on June 15, 1549, wishing to make it clear that his teaching "dissents not at all" from Bucer's. He states:

if you consider all things well, you will easily understand, when I say, the body of Christ is made present with us by faith: and we are incorporated by that communicating, and transmuted into Him, that I deviate not much from what you yourself teach. I acknowledge that we truly receive the thing of the sacrament, that is the body and blood of Christ; but I say thus, as this is done by soul and faith, and meanwhile I grant that the Holy Spirit is effectual in the sacraments, by the power of the Spirit and institution of the Lord. But I endeavour to hold this particularly against superstitions, lest the body and blood of Christ be mixed with bread and wine themselves, carnally and through a corporeal presence. But that we ourselves are truly joined to Him I do not question, nor would I have the sacramental symbols to be without honour and dignity. Only one thing remains by which you could perhaps be offended, that I claim that it does not agree (convenire) to the body and blood of Christ, as so greatly glorified, to be in many places. But as you see, Scripture does not signify this to be believed, the reason of a human body contradicts it, and the Fathers declare that this is granted to no creature, God excepted, nor does any greater utility come to us for that. You see that to the use of the sacrament, I grant as much as I can through the Word of God whence I am persuaded, equally with what you would grant ... Martyr concludes by reaffirming their agreement, and inviting criticism.

Bucer's reply is a most significant document. Bucer knew the English situation well, and was aware of the temptation to cater to the more symbolic view of the Supper held by the Swiss party in England. He too (letter of June 20, Sc. Ang. p 54) acknowledges their unity of thought and life, and trusts that Martyr will accept his suggestions as to what he would have altered in the Acts -

which he has read thoroughly. We may set out Martyr's Propositions, with Bucer's alterations.

1. In sacramento Eucharistiae non est pani et vini transubstantiatio in corpus et sanguinem CHRISTI.
(Bucer: accept this simpliciter)
2. Corpus et sanguis CHRISTI non est carnaliter aut corporaliter in pane et vino, nec ut alij dicunt, sub speciebus panis et vini.
(Bucer: replace by these or similar words: Corpus Christi non continetur localiter in pane et vino: nec iis rebus affixum aut adiunctum est ulla huius mundi ratione)
3. Corpus et sanguis CHRISTI uniuntur pani et vino sacramentaliter.
(Bucer: add this: Ita ut credentibus Christus hic vere exhibetur: fide tamen, nullo vel sensu vel ratione huius seculi intuendus, recipiendus, fruendus).

Bucer explains his alterations in terms of the sad state of the German Church (the Interim had begun) and the need for maintaining the reception of Christ in the Sacrament planius pleno ore. In the second Prop. therefore, he would not deny a real and "substantial" presence of Christ, and in the third, he would prefer an explicit reference to the "exhibition" of Christ. The problem of concord among the Churches on this question has been to him like the stone of Sisyphus (quasi saxum Sisyphi) which has ground him down. Yet he will not admit "either an impanation of Christ or a local connection of this world in the symbols". On the other hand, he cannot agree that the elements are "signs of a wholly absent Christ" by which we make a memorial only. Others, of course, wish the recordatio to lift up the soul into heaven and enjoy Christ there, or judge that Christ is there exhibited wholly (as God and man) and "they would use those words and say that the body of Christ is exhibited corporeally because His body is exhibited, substantially because His substance, carnally because His flesh". Further, Bucer agrees with Martyr in rejecting an eating of Christ by the wicked ("the presence of Christ is exhibited in the Sacrament simply to one's salvation" - cf. Sc. Aug. 623 for Bucer's denial of the mand. imp., following Aug. just as Martyr does). He also reminds Martyr that he and Philip (Melancthon) have always utterly abhorred Ubiquitatem Christi secundum hominem. He rejects a presence of Christ localiter, or by a connection huius mundi - these are his typical phrases delimiting the mode of presence, and he feels that these do not exclude the Lutherans. Finally he states that by faith comes "a receiving and presence not feigned nor only verbal (dictam) but real and of the substance of Christ Himself". Therefore, Bucer concludes, omit those terms from Prop. II.

This letter indicates the teaching of Bucer to be essentially one with Martyr's, a difference in emphasis, strongly advanced by eirenical motives, making for a distinctive difference in Bucer's manner of speaking. Martyr emphasizes a "local" presence of Christ's Body in heaven, and the sursum corda as the movement of faith in the Supper; Bucer will not give these a like emphasis, as his 54 English aphorisms (Exmoloxesis, sive confessio ... de s. Euch. ... 1550, Sc. Aug. pp 538-545) clearly show. In these he refers to this "high mystery" of communion with Christ,

which is above reason and therefore only metaphorically indicated by human terminology (9-13); although he agrees with the truth of the humanity of Christ, which is now in a heavenly place, he refuses to follow Aristotle's doctrine (De Nat. IV) about this (25-27); he allows the non-Scriptural speech of the Fathers, but is cognizant of the errors to which they have led, and agrees with their localizing the Body of Christ in heaven so long as this is not made a necessary doctrine (28-30); he reaffirms the weakness of human capacity, and need for emphasizing a real presence; he describes the symbols as signa exhibitiva - (Calvin's distinctive phrase)(45), and such exhibition is well termed by the Fathers "representation" (54).

Bucer was genuinely sorry for Martyr's terminology in the Disputations - he wrote to Brentius: "I am as sorry for master Martyr's book as any one can be; but that disputation took place, and the propositions were agreed upon, before I arrived in England. At my advice he has inserted many things in the preface whereby to express more fully his belief in the presence of Christ" (Orig. Lett. II. p 544 - May 15, 1550). He continues by describing a powerful group in England who would confine Christ "to a certain limited place in heaven; and talk so rapidly about His exhibition and presence in the supper, (may, some of them cannot even endure these words) that they appear to believe that nothing else but the bread and wine is there distributed". A letter to Niger (quoted by Hopf. op.cit. p 79) extends this idea: "he acknowledges the presence and exhibition of Christ; but, since the Zurich people have here many and great followers, this excellent man was drawn, I hardly know how, to consent to use the word 'Signification', although he added 'efficacious', by which he understands the exhibition of Christ, as he himself explains it in the Preface to his Disputations, in which by my advice he added many observations to his own, and withdrew some; for he is most desirous of a pious concord. Those who had hitherto listened to my explanation of this Mystery, especially those who care for the kingdom of Christ, approved it".

In App. E we give extended quotations from the Preface which apparently owes so much to Bucer. But we submit that all Martyr says there does not extend the doctrine of the sacraments he had taught ever since his Catechism of 1544. For in that earliest publication (sect. 42) he taught explicitly that the verba visibilia were signs by which "all the promises of God's mercy are effectively represented to us" so that "we are sure partakers of the matter itself". Martyr's understanding of signum does not follow that of the "Zürich people" but rather that of the συνέλον of the Fourth Gospel, related especially to the flesh of Christ as the archetypal signum - so we tried to show in Part I of this work. Certainly Martyr's teaching in the Tract. and Def. rejects the very same errors which Bucer fights to keep out. But in the Disputation itself, Martyr's teaching upon the sacramental mutation in the elements can hardly be called "Zwinglian"! And the Swiss Party in England did not accept Martyr as ally, as their correspondence shows. Hooper wrote to Bullinger the month before the Disp. that "Peter Martyr and Bernardine (Ochino) so stoutly defend Lutheranism, and there is now arrived a third (I mean Bucer), who will leave no stone unturned to obtain a footing"; in Nov. he sent the Disp. to Bullinger, with no comment; but by Oct. 1551, he could call Martyr "a brave and godly soldier in the army of the Lord" (Orig. Lett. I, pp 61, 70, 97). Burcher, it is true, made a sharp distinction between Martyr, whose Treatise he sent to Bullinger, "being unwilling to deprive you any longer of so great a pleasure"

(Orig. Lett. II p 680) and Bucer, whose death he hailed (Ibid. p 678) as affording England "the greatest possible opportunity of concord" (cf. p 662).

What was Martyr's true relation to Bucer and to Bullinger? As to the latter, he unconsciously identified his doctrine of the Eucharist with Bullinger's: "You congratulate me upon the happy result of the disputations, which however is rather to be attributed to you than to me, since you have for so many years both taught and maintained that doctrine which I there undertook to defend" (Orig. Lett. II p 478); and about the Cons. Tig.: "What you have mutually agreed upon respecting the sacrament of the eucharist is very gratifying to me ... I go along with you altogether, and scarcely deliver any other sentiment in this place" (Ibid., p 493). This would suggest that Martyr did not consider Bullinger to have advanced so strikingly as is commonly held, under Calvin's influence, so that the Cons. Tig. marks a positive step forward in Zürich doctrine. Martyr's First Zürich Oration (1556) mentions "the orthodox opinion of the Eucharist, which also you men of Zürich, as the prime and in one sense the only patrons, always defended most constantly". Nevertheless, Martyr does not seem to have been accepted at Zürich so openly (cf. Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria, Tig. 1598 - a brief reference in Part II suffices for Martyr), except perhaps by Bullinger himself, who did not meet Martyr until 1543, when the latter was en route to Germany, and who probably became intimate with him only from 1549 onwards. Certainly the closing years of Martyr's life show as close a relationship to Bullinger as was enjoyed to Bucer in the Strassburg period of 1543-1547.

These complex and often apparently contradictory facts mean this at least, that there was a degree of unity existing among the Reformers far beyond what their successors allow, or have since maintained. It means that between the cleavage of Lutheran and Zwinglian emerged a positive theology which was in a profound sense the true gravitational centre of the Reformation: not Wittenberg or Zürich, but the Strassburg of Bucer, from which both Calvin and Martyr went forward to a massive and powerful theology. It means that the more comprehensive and influential theology of John Calvin was representative of the Reformation as a whole as no other could be. Such implications are particularly borne out by Martyr's history, for he was a truly "ecumenical" Reformer, closely associated with Bucer, Calvin, Cranmer and Bullinger among others.

To conclude this section on Martyr's relationship to Bucer, we may say that although Bucer had some cause to suspect Martyr's liking for the Zürich doctrine, yet in the context of Martyr's whole theology, and his personal and theological unity with Bucer himself (on Bucer's death he wrote to Hubert "I seem mutilated of more than half of my self") we must conclude that the two men were essentially one in their doctrine of the sacraments. Hopf, (op.cit. p 18) therefore is wrong to make so much of Bucer's criticism of Martyr's terminology. The fundamental theological doctrines, and even expressions, are common to both - for instance, the teaching of duplex os fidelium, the unity of Word and Sacrament in effectiveness, the doctrine of analogy as operative in the sacramental relationship, and the analogia fidei as normative (cf. A Lang, Der Evangelienkommentar Martin Butzers . . . Leipzig 1900, esp. pp 435ff).

One basic problem operative in all this history was the concept of substantia.

Bucer's use of this word led the Lutherans to regard him as an ally, but Martyr interprets his doctrine as identical with his own, so that substance for Bucer signifies that true Body of Christ which faith apprehends (in Def. 634). Martyr deals at length with Gardiner's appeal to Bucer's use of the term substantia. It is in Calvin's new and distinctive use of the term that we find the resolution of this problem.

Calvin and Martyr.

Martyr regarded Calvin as "the most eminent and noble expositor of holy Scripture of our times" (De Vot. 1424D), while Calvin termed Martyr optimus et integerrimus vir (to Cramer, Epist. et Resp. 127), and again, speaking of the struggle to refute the doctrine of local presence in the Sacrament, stated, "The whole was crowned by Peter Martyr, who has left nothing to be desired". (True Partaking, etc. - Tracts, II p 535). The relations between Calvin and Martyr were never anything else than cordial, and represented a steadily increasing bond of thought and purpose which made their teaching identical. Through controversy, Calvin in regard to the doctrine of predestination and Martyr to the Eucharist, each stressed certain points quite differently from the other; but basically their theology is one. Our study of Martyr's sacramental theology has shown that the basic elements of accommodation, analogy, the office of the Holy Spirit, faith as union with Christ, and the triplex munus of the mystical Body of Christ, so clearly expressed in Calvin's theology, are equally present in Martyr's. Does this apply to the doctrine of Sacrament as much? Yes: a comparison of Calvin's Tracts on the Eucharist and the teaching of the Institutes (IV. 14-19) reveals a similarly striking coincidence of doctrine and phraseology. This is particularly obvious in respect of the doctrine of analogy. We could equally well apply Barth's delineation of Calvin's doctrine of analogy (e.g. Fides Quaerens Intellectum, 1931 - cf. Kirch. Dog. II.1, pp 254-275 for Barth's treatment of analogy in general (in 'Die Wahrhaftigkeit Menschlicher Gotteserkenntnis'), and pp 87-92 on the analogia entis) to the theology of Peter Martyr: analogia gratiae, analogia analogans and analogia analogata. A significant question in this respect would be whether Martyr places more stress on the analogated reality than Calvin does, at least in controversy, and what effect this had on his doctrine of the increase of our union with Christ. In this respect, too, both theologians appreciate the Patristic doctrine of the bodily renewal through the Eucharist (accepted rather in terms of Augustine's "participation" than of the Greek "deification") and this could be related to the analogia entis that comes through the analogia fidei - a doctrine very marked in Martyr's O.T. commentaries, as we saw in Chapt. 2. A further comparison here is Barth's doctrine of the "soteriological inversion" operative in the sacramental action: Martyr says, "outward things nothing profit to salvation, unless there be a mutation or change made by the Holy Spirit in our hearts, either before or during their use" (in Rom. 2.25).

An excellent modern study (cf. Nevin's Mystical Presence, Phil. 184 for an older work) of this question is given by Jean Cadier (op. cit.), whose careful examination of the history of the Calvinistic teaching yields significant conclusions. In dealing with Martyr's doctrine, of the Tractatio he says "Sa pensée est essentiellement calviniste" and cites the principal elements of the Calvinistic doctrine to be found there: inner witness of the Spirit, faith

engendered in our hearts by His testimony, incorporation into Christ, life in Him - and comments, "Pierre Martyr insiste peut être plus que Calvin sur un bienfait de la Cène, qui est d'établir un lien entre les croyants, membres du même corps, grains formant un même pain" (p 112). At Poissy, continues Cadier, his private declaration (see our App. E) is "an excellent resume of doctrine, in all points according with the calvinistic doctrine", and his final conclusion is: "On peut donc considérer Pierre Martyr comme pleinement d'accord avec Calvin dans sa doctrine sur la Sainte Cène". (p 115).

We may well conclude that Martyr and Calvin teach the same doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and in relation to the central thesis of this Appendix, we submit: that these three Reformers, Bucer, Calvin and Martyr, represent a unified theology of ecumenical dimensions and purpose, reflecting their historical position as united in a task of reformation which was essentially catholic. The distressing controversies with the Lutherans which involved both Calvin and Martyr in bitter debate, must be judged in relation to Bucer's acceptance of the Lutheran position as compatible with the theology shared by all three men, and indeed against the caveat we entered in our Critical Note to Chapt. 9, that perhaps Martyr (and Calvin) failed to appreciate the Lutheran position as one arising from within the Mystery of Christ Himself. At any rate, what is most striking is that while Lutheran could agree with Bucer, and "Zwinglian" with Martyr - Bucer and Martyr were conscious of being one in doctrine and purpose! Martyr said the week after Bucer's death, "I am now torn asunder from a man of the same mind with myself, and who was truly after my own heart" (to Hubert, Oxy. Lett. II, p 491)

The unity existing among the Reformers may be indicated by one final reference. A MS letter of Martyr's to Bucer, from Oxford on Nov. 11, 1550 (Corp. Christi Lib., Cambridge, MS 119.37) contains a few sentences upon a most significant matter. Alasco had written to Martyr expressing a desire that a confession about the Sacrament should be drawn up, and signed by Martyr, Bucer, Ochino and himself (cf. Strype, Men. of Cran. p 250). Martyr wrote to Bucer as follows: "I do not know whether Alasco has written to you what he signified to me so earnestly, about some kind of confession de re sacramentaria, as he termed it, enquiring whether you, Bernardino, himself and I would consent to this ... if you should subscribe, I also shall easily accord". This MS not only supports the thesis of the basic unity of Bucer and Martyr as to doctrine of the Eucharist (and of Ochino's share in that unity), but reminds us that Alasco (who identified himself with Bullinger as to doctrine) was much closer to that unity than is often appreciated. In a sense it is not Martyr but Calvin who succeeded in drawing together these precious strands into the golden chain of a theology historically and doctrinally representative of the Reformation. Yet the three, Bucer, Calvin and Martyr, must be considered as holding an essentially identical doctrine of the Eucharist, a doctrine positive and dynamic, in general transcending the false antithesis that so hampered the Reformation, in their teaching the "real presence" of the Divine-human Person Who nourishes His people by the virtue or power of His new humanity.

APPENDIX E : DEFINITIVE STATEMENTS OF PETER MARTYR'S EUCHARISTIC TEACHING.

1. From the Preface to the Tractatio of 1549
 (Epist. Nunc. pp9 - 34 of 1557 Ed.)

"I have determined to explain certain matters in a few words, lest by keeping silent I perhaps be held unwise, an innovator, a bold, rash and ungodly man, as though I took from the sacrament of the Eucharist its honour and dignity, or would obtrude the holy Supper to the Church without Christ ... But for my part I attribute so much to this sacrament as to say that in its exercise, the faithful obtain the greatest benefits which can be hoped for of God in this life ... just as the bread and wine (which feed the body) are given outwardly to the communicants, so is it truly granted unto their minds that by faith they eat the body and blood of Christ (given for our redemption): whereupon the whole man, both inward and outward, is restored to the greatest felicity. And this is the only way that Scripture allows and knows of eating the body and drinking the blood of the Lord, namely when we apprehend by a constant and firm faith that Jesus the Son of God our Saviour and Lord, gave His own body on the Cross and shed His blood for us, and that He has so embraced us who are given to Him by the Father, and so joined and incorporated us to Himself that He is our head, and we flesh of His flesh and bone of His bones, while He dwells in us and we in Him. In this stands the whole power and reason of this meat and drink, to which our faith is stirred up and kindled by the threefold Word: sometimes inwardly, while the Holy Spirit, by His secret yet mighty power, clearly incites our souls to renew these things with ourselves, that they may be embraced with lively and willing faith; to the same end are we many times moved by the help of the words of God (which pierce us either by outward sound or writing); and finally, that there should not lack any help to our infirmity, Christ added in the Supper bread and wine for signs, which are made sacraments by His words and institution, that is, organs by which the Holy Spirit excites faith in our minds, that by this we may be spiritually yet truly fed and sustained by His body and blood ...

"And in receiving the sacrament of the Eucharist, the memory of the Lord's death and of the whole mystery of our redemption through the incarnate Word of God is re-opened (memoria refricatur), the acknowledgment of God's testament is renewed, and there is offered the blessed communion of Christ and remission of sins through the sacrifice of Christ offered upon the altar of the Cross ... Lastly, because a man is not made to solitude, but is desirous of social and civil life, therefore when he is now convinced that he has the gracious divine will through Christ, and that through Him his sins are forgiven, nothing else is required to his perfect and absolute life while he lives here, except that he should live together with other men called in the Scripture neighbours, both in harmony and with the greatest justice and charity. But this sacrament most effectively and earnestly admonishes us of this. For in the mysteries we become sharers in the one Table (ἐκ κοινῆς πίστεως) what else should we resolve in mind than that we are one body, members one of another under Christ our Head, one bread, so conjoined among ourselves just as almost infinite grains of wheat coalesce in that bread which we take? ... If a profane table reconciles men to one another when they meet together, why should not the

Table of Christ effect this the more? ...

"But concerning the body of Christ, which you (adversaries) so greatly dislike me to deny as present: I will say a little for your satisfaction. If I should demand of you why there should be affirmed any such presence as you invent for yourself, you will, I believe, make me no other answer than that the body and blood of Christ may be joined to us. But since the whole work of this conjunction is heavenly and spiritual, this presence of yours which you so zealously contend for, is not at all required for this! What need is there of either physical contact or nearness of places? ... are not the faithful in Spain, Italy, Germany and France so joined with us as to be (as Paul says) members together with us? ... A plainer simile and more expressive may be yet used: Man and wife ... that unity of flesh is nothing hindered if the man should sometime be at London while the wife remain at Cambridge or Oxford ... Yet I would not have it thought, on account of these similes alleged by me, that I but lightly account or too much extenuate the union we have and daily enter into with Christ. For I know well that Scripture, to demonstrate its great compactness, is accustomed to declare that not only are we endowed with the Spirit, merit and intercession of Jesus, and act and live by His inspiration and Spirit, but also He Himself is with us, and dwells in our hearts by faith: He is our Head, he dwells in us and we in Him, we are born again in Him, His flesh is both given and received to be eaten and drunk. But I understand statements of this kind to be metaphorical, since proper speech cannot easily be had for these things - for words signify this or that as they are appointed to serve human ends. Wherefore when it comes to heavenly and divine things, natural man who understands not such great secrets, cannot as much as name them.

"Whence the Holy Spirit would take heed of our infirmity by this - having granted us a light and understanding to excel our nature, He also humbled Himself to these metaphors, namely abiding, dwelling, eating and drinking, that this divine and heavenly union which we have with Christ may in some way be known to us. And since these forms of speech consist of two things, the highest efficacy and a signification not proper but translated, they must be interpreted not rashly but with prudent and spiritual caution. This is used if we do not extenuate their sense more than is fitting, especially as applied to the Sacraments, nor attribute to them more than is suitable. The excessive speech of the Fathers and contempt of the Anabaptists (Hyperbolae patrum et Anabaptistarum contemptio) wonderfully obscured the Sacraments (particularly this one which we treat) - these judge it only a token of mutual charity, and cold and bare sign of the death of Christ, but those leave no divine thing not attributed to this sacrament, by which they impudently take a step into horrible idolatry.

"And no other way can that mediocrity we desire be retained, but by interpreting the phrases which we have rehearsed according to the analogy or convenience of holy Scripture. This requires that we tear not asunder the hypostatic (as they say) union of Christ on account of which the properties of the two natures (I mean the divine and the human) are communicated with each other; but yet this requires us to distinguish with sound understanding what we have communicated by alternation of the properties, so that the divinity is not made subject to human infirmities, and the humanity is not so much deified that it leave the bonds of its own nature and be destroyed. Therefore by a spiritual wisdom, such as is not

elsewhere provided than in holy Scripture, we must discern what is agreeable to Christ in respect of the one nature, and in respect of the other.

"And so the presence of the body of Christ which I remove from the Eucharist is that by which it is everywhere diffused, or in many places at once, so that it casts off quantity and circumscription, which are proper and necessary to a human body. Whence, if by 'Presence' any understand the perception of our faith by which we ourselves ascend to heaven, and by mind and spirit embrace Christ in His majesty and glory, to him will I easily consent. But I utterly abhor their opinion who contend that the body is closed and covered in the bread and wine, and affirm it to be under the species of these things, that they should worship and honour Him there - in short, they have erected an idol. This is the head and fountain of all contention, in this chiefly rests the state of all the present controversy ...

"To comprehend the whole in few words, these two things I earnestly affirm. One, that this Sacrament of the divine Supper is nothing without use. How true this is, other sacraments testify. The other is, that even when we use this, we take hold of the body of Christ and His blood by faith alone ... And this is the ground, strength and foundation of the opinion I have declared, namely that it is proper and fitting only to the divine nature to be everywhere by substance, and to fill all things; and on the other hand, this is the state and condition of human nature, that it is contained in a definite place, and within measures and spaces, and cannot disperse itself unto many or all places at one and the same time. ... Therefore those who cry out against me that I teach the Lord's Supper to be held without Christ, without His body and blood, let them take this for an answer: if they wish the presence of the body of Christ to be an apprehending of Him through faith, offered to us by the signification of words and signs, and exhibited by the benefit of the Lord, that (as I have said) I gladly and willingly admit ...

"Why have I used the words realiter, substantialiter, corporaliter and carnaliter in the questions of these disputations, since these are foreign words, wholly alien to the phrase of holy Scripture? I thought this too, and if I had been allowed to speak my own will would have utterly abstained from them, as being strange and even barbarous and ambiguous. But partly the use received in the schools, and partly the importunity of the adversaries has forced me to these; they, to hinder me more certainly (as they thought), paraded me before the people and ruder sort of priests, as though I overthrew the foundation of the sacrament of the Eucharist - by these grosser words they zealously affirmed the presence of Christ under the species (as they say) of bread and wine, and also published as effectively as possible the charge that I most heretically denied them ... When I deny the body of Christ to be present localiter, substantialiter, corporealiter et carnaliter, it must not be inferred that we eat the body of Christ fictè, simulate seu phantastice. For if by these words they understand the truth of the thing, I will not deny the body of Christ to be truly received by us. For what we comprehend by faith must not be held false or feigned, counterfeit or a phantom. ...

"I wished to write at greater length of this matter, since I easily think

that many are offended by these words, as I understand that some, and those, men excellent in godliness and learning, would not willingly have suffered them. Perhaps they will be more friendly to me when they understand both why I used them, and in what sense I affirm or deny the body and blood of the Lord to be present in the Supper. And that I may again make this manifest in fewest words, I declare those to be truly given and offered to us, by both words and symbols, while they are potently and most effectively signified through these. And again, in communicating, we truly receive the same when with full and solid assent of faith we grasp those things which are offered by the signification of words and signs. Whence it is that we are most closely joined with Christ, and Whom we have obtained in Baptism by the benefit of regeneration, Him we again put on more and more by the sacrament of food, since it is provided by nature that we are nourished by the same things of which we consist. And if we wish to be saved, we should always take care that Christ dwell in us and we in Him, until we are wholly converted into Him, and so converted that nothing of ours remains - of inborn death I mean, of corruption and of sin ..."

2. Judgment on the Eucharist delivered to the Strassburg Senate, 1553. (Clariss. et Magnif. Domin. Sch. Argent.)

"To the most renowned and esteemed governors of the Strassburg Academy, my most honoured masters, grace and peace from God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

"Since doubt is raised about the matter of the sacrament (de re sacramentaria) and the ministers of this Church fear lest any contentions arise in that respect through me, it seems well to repeat now in writing the same thing that I affirmed in your presence a few days ago. First, I readily embrace and acknowledge the Augustan Confession, and whatever others do not differ from it, if rightly and profitably understood. Next, no disputes or contentions shall be called forth through me: but rather, if any place in Scripture is to be treated, or if any other necessity require that I declare my opinion about such a question, I promise to do it with all modesty and without any bitter attack. But what my opinion is can be understood by the books already published by me. From these I wish to detract or alter nothing either by writing or by promise, until I shall be persuaded otherwise by the teaching of Scripture of Spirit. But since I have not subscribed to the concord made between Dr. Martin Bucer and Dr. Luther and his fellows, it is for this reason, that I cannot grant, through the Word of God and conscience, that those who are destitute of faith eat the body of Christ in receiving the sacrament (illos qui fide sunt destituti, percipiendo sacramenta corpus Christi sumere). Nor is it a wonder that I would not assent to this article, since Bucer himself in this School of ours, when I was present, publicly taught otherwise, when he expounded the Acts of the Apostles, and wrote far otherwise when he was in England (as I can show from certain of his articles). And indeed he judged rightly, since faith is the only instrument by which Christ's body and blood are received by us; if this is removed, the mouth of the body receives nothing unless sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, bread I mean and wine consecrated by the minister or officer of the

Church. Just as a man of adult age, if he come to Baptism without faith, we would say receives nothing but the sacrament, that is water, since by not believing he could not obtain the grace of regeneration: so without faith no one is admitted to the communion of the body and blood of Christ. Finally, I fear lest by subscribing to this concord proposed to me, I might seem to condemn the Church of Zürich, Basle, Berne, Geneva and England, and all the brethren scattered throughout Italy and France. But I do not think this is lawful to me through the Word of God. Accordingly, as I both honour and esteem the Churches of Saxony, so do I embrace in the Lord and greatly love these others which I have mentioned. May God, as He is the Author of peace, give us to speak and think all the same at last. And to you, my masters, most honoured for the courtesy and goodness which you show to me, I give the greatest thanks, since I can return you nothing else. And I pray the most good God, that through our Lord Jesus Christ He may be always gracious unto you. - December 27, 1553, in my hired lodgings at Strassburg".

3. Statements from the Colloquy of Poissy, 1561.
 (A: Sententia; B: Private opinion, preserved in
 Conde's Memoires, II, p 513)

A. "I judge the body and blood of Christ to be really and substantially only in the heavens, yet the faithful truly receive, spiritually and through faith, the communication of His true body and His true blood, which were delivered to the cross for our sake. Wherefore I absolutely reject transubstantiation and consubstantiation in the bread and wine of the Supper. Further, I affirm that the distance of places nothing hinders our conjunction with the body and blood of Christ, because the Lord's Supper is a heavenly matter, and although on earth we take bread and wine by the mouth of the body, sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, yet by faith and by the work of the Holy Spirit our souls, to which this spiritual and heavenly food pertains, are carried up into heaven and enjoy the present body and blood of Christ. And therefore I hold there to be no need of positing the body of Christ as present truly, substantially and corporeally, by a presence not local, either with us or with the symbols. I hold that the things signified by these are joined with the outward symbols not otherwise than sacramentaliter, since they are signified by them not profanely or lightly but effectively, by institution of the Lord. This is the sum of my faith which I follow in this dogma, and therefore I admit formulas adduced which consent with this reason, able to be referred or accommodated to the sense now explained: if any pervert or misinterpret these, I publicly disagree with him. And whereas in these speeches the substance of the body of Christ is mentioned, by that name or term I understand nothing else than the true body of Christ. For our faith is not directed to a fiction or phantom, but to the true and natural body, which the Word of God took of the blessed virgin, and gave for us on the cross. Wherefore there is no cause why we should be thought to believe that His real presence is elsewhere than in heaven ...".

B. "Since the promises of the New Testament are not at all vain, but full of efficacy and virtue, presenting us truly with what is promised there, and since a

living faith makes us actually participate in and enjoy what is offered us in them, it is necessary to believe and confess the presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Holy Supper, in which the substance of His flesh and of His blood is truly promised, offered and given to us as true meat and drink for the soul, according to this most holy Word: "Take, eat, this is My body; take, drink, this is My blood".

"The Holy Supper by a secret and ineffable operation effects in us, here on earth, this communication and participation of His Body, which dwells in heaven and not elsewhere, divinely accommodating His grandeur to our capacity, and joining places far distant: and as if visibly He unites heaven with earth by His power, to place His royal throne in the midst of the Supper (pour poser son siège royal au milieu de la Cène) and to give Himself more closely as the food of our soul; in the same way and still incomprehensibly, faith, by its wonderful property (vertu admirable) accommodates and lifts up our soul to heaven, and gives it opening and entrance to the throne of His majesty ... in this respect the Holy Spirit is, with faith, the sole medium and eternal minister of this heavenly and spiritual participation and manducation of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and not bread and wine, corruptible creatures which serve only as signs to teach the faithful that Jesus Christ is present at the Supper and gives Himself to them: thus do the creatures remain bare and stripped of all other substance: and the most one finds in them is the simple analogy of material signs, bread and wine, with the thing signified, which is heavenly bread: Jesus Christ the only true meat, drink, nourishment and life of our souls".